School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1346054

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BS
2825
S7
v.1

J. Edwin Roy

A

COMMENTARY

ON

THE APOCALYPSE.

BY

MOSES STUART,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT ANDOVER, MASS.

SECOND THOUSAND.

VOLUME I.

NEW-YORK:
VAN NOSTRAND & TERRETT,
123 FULTON STREET.
1851.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by
MOSES STUART,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PREFACE.

That the Apocalypse is a book replete with difficulties, not only for the common reader but also for the critic and interpreter, no one will deny who has earnestly applied himself to the study of it. The sources of difficulty, in respect to the prophetic part of it, are obvious, and may easily be stated. The book is made up of one continued series of symbols, unaccompanied for the most part by such plain and explicit declarations with regard to their meaning, as are generally to be found in like cases among the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. The original and intelligent readers of this book, beyond all reasonable doubt, could understand the meaning of the writer; else why should he address his work to them? Their acquaintance with the circle of things in which he moved, and their familiarity with the objects to which he refers, superseded the use of all the critical apparatus which we must now employ.

Not long, however, after the death of John, the Apocalypse appears to have been regarded as a wonderful and mysterious book, and to have given occasion to many strange and very discrepant interpretations. From that time down to the present, a similar state of things has existed in regard to the exposition of this work. And even with all the light which recent critical study has thrown upon the Scriptures in general, there yet remains, as is generally confessed, not a little of obscurity resting upon the Apocalypse.

Must this state of things always continue? This is a question of great interest to those, who believe that the Apocalypse rightfully belongs to the Canon of Scripture. Hitherto, scarcely any two original and independent expositors have been agreed, in respect to some points very important in their bearing upon the interpretation of the book. So long as the Apocalypse is regarded principally as an epitome of civil and ecclesiastical history, this must continue to be the case. Different minds will make the application of apocalyptic prophecies to different series of events, because there is something in each to which more or less of these prophecies is seemingly applicable. Such has always been the case, in past times, whenever this method of interpretation has been followed; and why should anything different from this be expected for the future? The consequence however has of course been, to create a kind of general distrust in the public mind, with regard to every effort made in order to explain the book in question. At a period somewhat early, the Apocalypse was excepted by

10349 School of Theology

some of the churches from the Canon of books to be publicly read for edification. And even after this exclusion ceased, it was still *practically* abstained from, or disregarded, by the great mass of Christians, from a consciousness that they were unable with any certainty to discover its true meaning, and from want of confidence in the expositions of it which had already been given.

Such, I regret to say, is still the state of things extensively, with regard to the book of Revelation. *Practically*, the prophetic parts of it are almost, if not entirely, excluded from the Scriptures. In spite of all which those recent interpreters have done, who find in it an epitomized civil and ecclesiastical history of ages remote from the time when it was written, confidence in their expositions has been, and is, generally withheld. As it seems to me, it must still continue to be withheld, so long as this method of interpretation is pursued.

But is it necessary that this method should be still pursued, and thus the book be virtually lost to the churches? I would hope not. The Apocalypse certainly breathes a precious, yea a most noble Christian spirit. Indeed there are few, if any, of the books in the New Testament, which are better adapted to animate and foster the spirit of primitive Christianity than this, when it is rightly understood. It is the belief of this, which has induced me to bestow so much time and pains as the present work has cost me, upon the exposition of it.

The ground on which I stand, or at least on which I aim to stand, is the same that I would occupy, in case I should endeavour to prepare myself for the interpretation of any or all other books of Scripture. I take it for granted, that the writer had a *present* and *immediate* object in view, when he wrote the book; and of course I must regard him as having spoken *intelligibly* to those whom he addressed. In order to find out his meaning, I have endeavoured to resort, as I would in all other cases, to the idiom; to the times in which the author lived; to the events then passing or speedily about to take place; to the circumstances in which he and his readers were placed, and which called forth his work; to the adaptation of the book to these circumstances; and (in a word) to all that is local and belongs to the times in which it was written, whether it be peculiarities in the mode of expression, thought, reasoning, or feeling, or anything else which would influence an author's style or manner of arranging his composition. My aim has been to abide by this method of interpretation, throughout the work. At the same time I have never forgotten, that the author is virtually a *poet* and also a *prophet*; for my belief is, that he is truly both, and therefore I have aimed never to lose sight of either character. If now these principles of interpretation, which I have admitted, and by which I have invariably designed to be guided—principles from which no one can swerve without the certainty of erring—if these are not right and just and well established,

then I have only to say, that I have hitherto wholly mistaken the science of interpretation, and have yet to learn its first and *constituent elements.*

I am aware that such as have become attached to the methods of interpreting the Apocalypse that are most current in the English and American churches, will probably, at least at first view, disagree with some of my results. I will not find fault with them for this; but they will allow me to entreat them to have patience with me, and not to decide at once on difficult points, but to make the book of the Revelation a subject of thorough and often repeated study. My own views, I mean such as I once had, have been changed by such a course. When I began my official duties in my present station, I had no other knowledge of the book, than what the reading of bishop Newton on the Prophecies, and of others who were of the like cast, had imparted to me. The Classes of Pupils under my instruction soon began to importune me to give them some information respecting the Apocalypse. I commenced the study of it, with a design to comply with their request. I soon found myself, however, in pursuing the way of regular interpretation as applied to other books of Scripture, completely hedged in; and I felt at the same time that to pursue my former method of interpreting the book, would cast me inevitably upon the boundless ocean of mere *conjectural* exposition. I frankly told my Pupils, therefore, that I knew nothing respecting the book which could profit them, and that I could not attempt to lecture upon it. After still further examination, I came to a resolution, not to attempt the exegesis of the Apocalypse, until a period of ten years had elapsed, which should be devoted, so far as my other duties would permit, to the study of the Hebrew prophets. I kept my resolution. After this period had passed, I began, with much caution, to say a few things, in the Lecture-room, respecting the book in question. Every three years, these Lectures, such as they were, I repeated, with some additions and alterations. In process of time I began to go through the whole book. This I have done several times; and the present work is the result of these often repeated and long continued labours.

I do not give this history of my undertaking, with a view to recommend my work to the confidence of the Christian public. It must stand or fall by its own merits. What I have now said, has been said rather in the way of apology for having engaged in an undertaking so hazardous as that of writing and publishing a Commentary on the *Revelation.* I have been led along step by step to my present position, without having originally designed to publish anything at all concerning the Apocalypse.

It will naturally be expected that I should state a few things, in regard to the plan and manner of my work.

Most of the Introduction, although arranged first in order, and first printed, was composed *after* the Commentary was completed. An obvious reason for this, was the necessity of the knowledge acquired by exegesis, in order to compose with any propriety the introductory part of the work.

My reasons for saying so much as I have respecting *apochryphal* Apocalypses, are given in their appropriate place, and I hope they may satisfy my readers. The value of these auxiliaries to exegesis and illustration, cannot well be over-estimated.

By far the severest task which I have had to perform, has been that of discussing the objections against the *apostolic* origin of the Revelation, drawn from the style, manner, and diction of the book, and from the doctrines which it contains. This has cost me more time and labour than the composition of the whole commentary. To state particularly the grounds and reasons of this, would be inapposite here. I will merely say, that those who have never performed such a task, cannot well have any adequate conception of it. It is literally true, that in some cases the *results* of a month's labour, or even more, occupy only a page or two, as exhibited by me. However, there is some comfort in the reflection, that what is established by appeal to *facts*, cannot well or speedily be overthrown.

My design has been to compose a work which should aid, in a particular manner, the young interpreter, and also that class of readers, who, although more advanced in life, have not enjoyed the requisite facilities and advantages for the more thorough exegetical study of the Scriptures. On this ground I have not felt at liberty to imitate the extreme brevity and compression of some distinguished recent interpreters in Germany; e. g. De Wette in his *Exegetical Manual for the N. Testament*, and Knobel in his *Exegetical Manual for Isaiah*. Such books are designed mainly for those already well versed in the business of interpretation. They are very appropriate and desirable in their place, and within the sphere in which they are intended to circulate. But much of my design, in the present case, would have been defeated by such a method of composition. I have sought to aid the learner, by laying before him, and explaining, so far as in my power, grammatical phenomena of every kind, peculiarities of idiom, peculiar views entertained in ancient times and specially by the Hebrew nation, and generally whatever might contribute to lead him to a right and full understanding of the author. On this ground, I have occasionally admitted into the body of the commentary, discussions or monograms on subjects particularly obscure and difficult, e. g. on the *two witnesses*, Rev. 11: 3; on *Gog and Magog*, 20: 8, etc. In other cases, where more ample space and time were requisite for discussion in order to illustrate or confirm anything which the text presents to view or to which it adverts, I have remitted the discussion to the end of the volume, and have thrown it there into the form of an *Excursus*. If I am not misled by my own views and judgment, most readers will feel as much interest in the discussions which the Excursus exhibit, as they will in anything of mine which is contained in the body of the work itself. It is impossible to do any adequate justice to such a difficult book as the Apocalypse, without pursuing a course substantially like to this.

unable to perform any mental labour. What I could do in such a state, in the way of correction, I have done. But there are portions of my work that I should have compressed, had it been possible for me to do it. There may be also some incongruities, at least in some things of minor importance, that have escaped me, while in such a state. The reader who feels kindly, will be disposed to put the best construction upon them that he can. I regret more than he can do, that I am obliged to make such an apology. But it is my duty to bow in submission to Him, who directs all things according to the counsel of his own will.

There may be some who will think, that under these disadvantages I ought not to have ventured on the publication of my work. It may be so; but I sought the best counsel I could obtain, and have acted in conformity with it. If the work were to be published at all, (and the public had been given to understand, by some well-meaning but rather unwary friends, that it would be), it was best that it should be accomplished so far as it might be, while I could keep my eye upon it. I had much reason to expect, that the time in which I could do this would not be long.

And now, as a kind Providence has spared my life to see the completion of the printing, what am I to *hope* for, or to *expect*, from the publication of my work?

I hope for a patient hearing. I hope that the readers of the work will make a *thorough* examination of the whole matter, before they decide that I am in the wrong. I hope that all, who have never made the Hebrew prophets and the figurative and symbolical representations of the Scriptures a subject of special study and investigation, will be slow and cautious in deciding what meaning should be attached to the symbols of the Apocalypse. I hope that a lively fancy, or an expertness in guessing, will not be considered as the best helps to the exegesis of such a book. Heartily as I abhor the mummery, and knavery, and superstition, and pollution, so wide-spread in the Romish church, and much as I disapprove of all its hierarchical institutions, I still hope that a mere spirit of opposition to Papal abominations will not be regarded as the proper and authorized exponent of what John has said respecting the beast and the false prophet. I hope that in respect to this as well as other matters of difficulty in the Apocalypse, my readers will not meet my expositions, merely with the accusation of departure from opinions long current in the English and American churches. The proper question is not, whether I have broached any opinions which seem new or strange to this reader or to that, but whether what I have said will abide the test of a *hermeneutical* trial. I hope that such readers as have been led merely or principally by the conjectural interpretations of former days which they have perused, will not feel that they are adequately prepared to pronounce authoritatively a sentence of condemnation at once on the views which I have advanced. I hope, also, in case they do, that I shall be enabled to bear with a good degree of equanimity the censure of judges, either

few or many, who possess no other qualifications than these to decide upon such matters. Ready as some may be to condemn, I must still cherish the hope that due allowances will be made by most readers, for the great difficulties which I have had to encounter, in the exposition of such a book as the Apocalypse. That errors may be found in my work, I do not question. *To err is human.* I claim no exemption from the common frailty, and only hope that I may be forgiven, where my errors are discovered. I am conscious of no party-purposes in publishing my work. I have sought for truth earnestly and sincerely on the present occasion, if I ever did or could do so; and where I have failed to obtain it, I hope the mantle of charity and kindness will be thrown over my failures. If the reader of my work gets any assistance from it, which will help him better to understand the Scriptures in any respect, he will be disposed to deal gently with me as to things which he cannot approve, or with which he cannot agree.

As to what I *expect;* my anticipations are not of a sanguine or overweening cast. I know that after so long a period, in which darkness has brooded over this book, it is not the work of one man, or even of one age, to arrive at established conclusions in all matters that pertain to the Apocalypse. Consequently I do not expect that my work will complete this task. But I do expect, at least I hope, that if it should accomplish nothing more, it may be the means of exciting more attention to the book of Revelation, and of calling forth some new and more successful efforts for its interpretation. Should what I have written be the means of calling forth little else but animated opposition, there is hope, even in this, of arriving sooner or later at something better than we have hitherto obtained. Should it serve, in any good measure, to give somewhat of a *new* direction in our churches to the *method of studying* the book, this may lead on to some important results, and I shall not have written in vain.

And now with a trembling hand and a heart full of solicitude, I commit this work to the churches, and to the Great Head of them. Whatever imperfections it has, it is still the result of an effort to vindicate the wounded honour of the Apocalypse, and to render the book once more, in all its parts, intelligible and useful and edifying to well-meaning readers. Perhaps I cannot reasonably expect to live long enough to vindicate such portions of my work as may be assailed; but so far as probability and truth are on my side, there are others who will see that such is the case, and who will so far defend what I have advanced.

Beyond this, I would hope for no defence. My only wish is, that the churches may sooner or later come to regard the book in question in the same manner as its primitive readers regarded it, and that it may once more be placed before the churches in the same light in which its author originally designed to place it.

M. STUART.

Theological Seminary,
Andover, Feb. 1845.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

Page

§ 1. General Remarks 9

§ 2. Comparison of the Apocalypse with other scriptural prophecies 11

§ 3. Are similar views to be found among the heathen? . . 26

§ 4. Estimation of the apocalyptic style, at the time when the Apocalypse was composed 31

§ 5. Apocryphal Apocalypses which have perished . . . 37

§ 6. Apocryphal Revelations still extant 40

(*a*) The Ascension of Isaiah . 40
(*b*) The book of Enoch . . 50
(*c*) Fourth book of Ezra . . 74
(*d*) Sibylline Oracles . . 87
(*e*) Testament of the twelve Patriarchs 107
(*f*) The Shepherd of Hermas . 113
(*g*) The apocryphal Apocalypse of John 122
(*h*) General Remarks on all these compositions . . . 124

§ 7. Peculiar form and arrangement of the Apocalypse . . 127

Numerosity:

(*a*) Trichotomy 131
(*b*) Heptades 144
(*c*) Groups of four . . . 146
(*d*) Groups of twelve . . 146
(*e*) Decades 147
(*f*) Parallelisms 147
(*g*) General Remarks on *Numerosity* 149

§ 8. Is the Apocalypse a drama? 150

§ 9. Object of the book 155

§ 10. Economy of the Apocalypse, or manner of developing the plan 164

§ 11. Aesthetical character of the Apocalypse 191

§ 12. Hermeneutical principles applicable to the Apocalypse . . 197

§ 13. Original readers of the Apocalypse, and their circumstances . 216

§ 14. Original language of the Apocalypse 228

§ 15. Peculiar characteristics of language and style in the Apocalypse 232

§ 16. Place and time of writing the Apocalypse 257

§ 17. Author of the Apocalypse 283

I. *Historical evidence in favour of the apostle John.*

(1) Testimony of the book . 288
(2) Of Polycarp . . . 300
(3) Of Papias 302
(4) Of Justin Martyr . . 307
(5) Of Melito 311
(6) Theophilus of Antioch . 312
(7) Of Apollonius . . . 313
(8) Of Irenaeus 313
(9) The Epistle of Vienne and Lyons 316
(10) Clement of Alexandria . 317
(11) Of Tertullian . . . 318

(12) Other early witnesses . 320
(13) Of Hippolytus . . . 321
(14) Of Origen 322
(15) Of Nepos and Coracion . 324
(16) Of Cyprian 324
(17) Of Victorinus . . . 325
(18) Of Methodius . . . 325
(19) Of Lactantius . . . 326
(20) Of Athanasius . . . 326
(21) Of Ephrem Syrus . . 327
(22) Of Hilary 328
(23) Of Epiphanius . . . 328
(24) Of Basil 329
(25) Of Gregory Nazianzen . 329
(26) Of Chrysostom . . . 330
(27) Of Ambrose and others . 331
(28) Of Ruffin, Synod of Hippo, etc. 331
(29) Of Augustine . . . 332
(30) Of Jerome 332
(31) Later testimonies . . . 334

II. *Alleged testimony against John as the author.*

(1) Opposition by the Alogi . 336
(2) By Caius the Presbyter . 339
(3) By Dionysius of Alexandria 344
(4) Doubts of Eusebius . . 354
(5) Of later writers . . . 357
(6) Omitted in the Old Syriac Version 365

§ 18. Result of historical testimony 368
§ 19. Indirect and internal evidence against apostolic origin: General Remarks 371
§ 20. Principles which should guide us in judging of the style and diction 374
§ 21. Examination of particular objections deduced from the diction, style, and manner of the Apocalypse 377
Also from the doctrines and modes of thought . . . 392
§ 22. Internal evidence in favour of the apostle John as author . 405
§ 23. Result 411
§ 24. Examination of the theory of authorship by Schott and Lücke 422
§ 25. Unity of the Book 427
§ 26. Canonical rank and credit 437
§ 27. Historical sketch of the Exegesis of the book . . . 450
§ 28. Was the Apocalypse intended for the use of the church in every age? 427 475
§ 29. Does the plan of the Apocalypse involve anachronism? . . 484

Appendix.

Extracts from the Commentary of Victorinus . . . 491
Specimen of the Ascension of Isaiah 495
Specimens of the book of Enoch 499

The obvious meaning is, that the heathen on all sides shall come and participate in the blessings of the gospel.*

(41) In Matt. 28: 19, 20. Mark 16: 15, the disciples of Jesus are commanded to go and teach *all nations*, to go and preach the gospel to *every creature*.

(42) John 3: 16, 17, tells us, that God so loved the *world*, as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him should not perish, but have everlasting life; and that God sent his Son, in order that the *world* through him might be saved.

(43) In John 10: 16 we are told by the Saviour, that he has other sheep which are not of the Jewish fold; that they must hear his voice; and that there will be one fold and one Shepherd.

(44) In John 12: 32 it is said, that when Jesus is lifted up, he will draw all men unto him.

(45) John 17: 20, 21. Jesus prays not for his disciples only, but for all who would believe on him through their word, that they all might be one.

(46) In Acts 1: 8, the apostles are told by the Saviour, that they should be witnesses for him, not only in Judea and Samaria, but in the uttermost parts of the earth.

(47) In Acts 10: 34, 35, Peter declares, after a divine vision so instructing him, that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.

(48) In Acts 15: 16, 17, James declares, that according to ancient prophecy, the tabernacle of David is to be again built, that the residue of men . . . and all the Gentiles might seek after the Lord.

(49) Acts 17: 30. God now commands all men, everywhere, to repent.

(50) Acts 28: 28. The salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles, and they will listen to it.

(51) In the epistle to the Romans, the fact that salvation belongs equally to the Jews and Gentiles is one of the main themes of discussion. Comp. 1: 13—16. 3: 29, 30. 4: 16, 17. 5: 18—21. 10: 11—21. In chap. 11: 25—32 are most specific declarations, that the Jews, with the fulness of the Gentiles, will be brought in, and so all Israel shall be saved. Here is the germ of the whole Apocalypse, or at least the same kind of germ as that from which the Apocalypse sprung.

(52) Everywhere, in Paul, the like sentiments are to be found. It would be superfluous to cite them. Let the reader compare Gal. 3: 7—9, also vs. 22—29. Eph. 1: 10. 2: 11—22, which is very full and

* I have purposely omitted Matt. xxiv. here; because I have, in the sequel, drawn it and the parallel passages in the other Evangelists more particularly into comparison with the Apocalypse.

express. See also Heb. 8: 8—13. Many other places of the like tenor might easily be quoted.

(53) In 1 John 2: 2, he will find the beloved disciple echoing the sentiments of his Lord and Master, by declaring that Jesus Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and again (4: 14), that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.

Many of the texts in the New Testament, to which I have now referred, do not indeed directly assert the universality of the actual spread of the Gospel, but only the universality of its *design*. But that it will ultimately be made to accomplish its design, yea, that it will *fully* accomplish it, who that confides in the promises of the Saviour will venture to doubt?

We have then here the same idea everywhere presented, as that which forms the basis of the Apocalypse, viz. the *universality* of the Christian religion, and of course its final triumph over all the spirits of error and all the powers of darkness. As this idea evidently pervades the plan of redemption, so it also pervades the Scriptures which have revealed that plan. The benevolence of God stands pledged for the accomplishment of it.

§ 3. *Are views similar to these to be found among the heathen?*

We may answer this question in the affirmative, or in the negative, according to the sense which we assign to the word *similar*, contained in the title of this section. If we mean to ask: Whether a Messiah, a Saviour of men from the power and penalty of sin by the offering up of his own body as an expiatory sacrifice, and thus procuring eternal redemption for sinful men, has been proclaimed by the heathen; whether the pure, spiritual, holy, catholic religion taught by him, and designed to be spread among all nations in order to make them converts, and also to produce its full influence upon them, has been published by the unenlightened heathen; then the answer is plain. The Gospel, as contained in the Scriptures, old and new, but specially in the new—the Gospel only makes such disclosures as these. The wisdom of God, as exhibited in this, was "hidden from ages and from generations;" so that "the world by wisdom knew not God." There is nothing among all the developments of unenlightened heathen, which has any tolerably strict resemblance to the highly important truths that have just been mentioned.

But our inquiry may well be modified so as to express a view of this subject which is more *generic*. We may refer, in our question, to the simple wish or hope of future deliverance from evils such as the present to which our race are exposed; and then we may answer in the affirma-

tive, at least to a certain extent and within limits which are of a somewhat moderate compass.

There is in the breast of man a consciousness of dependence and of ill desert, accompanied by a desire to propitiate the Being, or those Superior Powers, on whom he feels himself to be dependent, and whom he believes himself to have offended. Witness the expiatory sacrifices, the penances, and all the ascetic rites and usages to which the heathen world have in some form or other resorted. Every man of thought and reflection is conscious of his own weakness and woes, and conscious also that he is capable of enjoying something higher and nobler than that which he now possesses and enjoys; he therefore naturally, as a rational being made in the image of God, looks forward with hope to something better than what he now possesses. Evils are pressing constantly upon him. From the moment in which he opens his eyes upon life to that in which he closes them in death, they do not cease to urge him. To pain, sickness, pestilence, hunger, thirst, the inclemency of the elements, the changes of seasons, storms, tempests, earthquakes—to the loss of friends and of estate, yea to innumerable other woes from *without*, he must be continually exposed in his present state. From *within* his sufferings are not less. His immortal mind is so connected with his bodily frame, that almost every evil which assails the latter, must also affect the former. And besides; what a mass of inconsistencies does he find within himself! So much wisdom linked with so much folly; so much consideration joined to so much rashness; such exalted conceptions followed by such low and groveling desires; such lofty aspirations after something purer and more satisfactory to the nature of the soul, and yet quickly followed by a retinue of appetites that may degrade him below the brutes which perish! What a mystery, what an inexplicable enigma, is man when viewed merely in such a light!

There have been minds in every age and nation, which have reflected on subjects such as these, and have, as it were instinctively, been led to indulge hopes or expectations of deliverance at some future period, from a condition in which such things must be suffered. But without light from above, specially in regard to the mode and time of deliverance, redemption from such evils could scarcely be regarded as attainable; and all that could be argued in favour of believing in it was, that the benevolence of the Godhead and the nature of man seem to require it. It would follow, of course, that where the light of revelation had not been shed, conjecture in relation to this great subject would move in various directions, and be guided very much by the circumstances of the individual who indulged it.

As an example, however, of the manner in which the hopes or wishes of a heathen could be expressed, in regard to some future deliverance

from the evils of the present world, we may appeal to the fourth Eclogue of Virgil, inscribed to the consul Pollio; specially to the passage which begins thus:

> Ultima Cumaei venit jam carminis aetas;
> Magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo; etc.

The passage is too familiar to need further quotation or description. That Virgil has here copied from the ancient Cumaean Sibyl, and that the composition before us contains a real *Messianic* prediction, is an opinion at least as old as Lactantius (Instt. VII. 24), and Constantine the Great (Orat. ad Sanct. in Euseb. Vita Constant. c. 19). In recent times, Chandler, Whiston, Cudworth, and many others, have been of the like persuasion; and even Bishop Lowth (Lect. XXI. on Hebrew Poetry) seems hardly able to refrain from the belief of a divine inspiration in this beautiful piece of composition. I cannot but observe, however, that it lies on the face of Virgil's whole representation, that his poetic hopes were limited merely to *civil* and *social* prosperity and happiness. How different the whole tenor of this is, from the view presented by the Apocalypse where all is *moral* and *Christian*, no sensible reader needs to be informed.

But we may go further back than Virgil, and find among some remote oriental nations the idea of a general ἀποκατάστασις. The books of Zoroaster, so long spoken of by Greek, Roman, and Christian writers, before and after the birth of Christ, but known to them only by report, have at last been in part rescued from their obscurity and brought before the world, in a translation by Anquetil du Perron of the last generation. Zoroaster, the far-famed author of these books, written in the *Zend* language, i. e. the language of ancient Media, in all probability flourished about the middle of the 6th century before Christ, a little before, or during, the reign of Darius Hystaspes. The sum of his ἀποκατάστασις, as exhibited in the Zend Avesta, and in the Bun Dehesh, which is a commentary on it written some 1100 or 1200 years ago, I will briefly state in a note, for the satisfaction of the reader.*

* Before all things existed *Zeruane Akerene*, i. e. *Time without Limits*, or endless eternity (*ewige Ewigkeit*, as Kleuker translates it). This infinite Being produced two others, Ahriman and Oromasd. Both were good at first; but Ahriman fell from his primitive holy state, and became essentially malignant. The Supreme Being assigned to these two beings, who after the fall of Ahriman became rivals and enemies of each other, a cycle of 12,000 years in which they were to act. The first 3000 was assigned exclusively to Oromasd or Ormusd for predominance; and in this period he created Feruers, i. e. the essences (like the Platonic ἰδέαι) of all beings. During the second 3000 years, Oromasd was employed in creating all that is good, and Ahriman (in opposition to him) in creating all that is bad. When Ormusd at length brought the race of man into existence, Ahriman, and the evil angels and genii whom he had created, entered into contest

It would lead me aside from my present object, to dwell on the points of resemblance between Zoroaster's scheme of religion and that exhibited particularly in the latter part of the Apocalypse. It must be admitted that there are some striking points of resemblance; and some there are, also, of difference equally striking. That Zoroaster makes his ἀποκατάστασις *universal* and *complete*, springs necessarily from the nature of his Dualism, and from the promise of *Time without Limits* to Ormusd, at the commencement of the great cycle, that his triumph should at last be certain and complete. John, in the Apocalypse, presents us with a view of the final condition of the beast and false prophet, together with Satan and his adherents, which is very different. The *second* death which they are sentenced to undergo, admits of no restoration. If the writer of the Apocalypse knew anything of the doctrines of the Zend-Avesta, (which has of late been strenuously asserted), he has at least taken the liberty often and widely to depart from them.* But still, must we say now that the author of the Apocalypse has, in common with the heathen, merely adorned a general principle which is spontaneous as it were to our nature, by inventing a sublime and beautiful allegory for this purpose? The attentive and judicious reader will hardly say this. The difference between the *moral* hue of the Apocalypse, and that of all the heathen fables which bear any general resemblance to parts of it, is exceedingly great, and lies indeed upon the very face of the book.

It may not be out of place here to remark, that it is no objection to the doctrine of one only living and true God as taught in the Scriptures, that many of the heathen had exalted conceptions of the Divinity, which

---

with Ormusd and his good angels and genii; the first aiming to corrupt and destroy everything good, the last striving to defend and preserve it. This contest continued in a doubtful state for the third period of 3000 years, sometimes Ormusd and sometimes Ahriman prevailing. During the fourth or last period of 3000 years, Ahriman is to have the predominance, although opposition to him on the part of Ormusd and all good beings is never to cease. At the end of this period, when the great cycle is completed, comes the general ἀποκατάστασις. The dead are all to be raised and brought to judgment. The earth is to be burned up, and thus to be purified from all the remains of evil which Ahriman and his agents had mingled with it. A new heavens and a new earth is to come forth from this conflagration of the old. The wicked, who had been the adherents and followers of Ahriman, are to be punished in a dreadful manner, along with him, until finally all will become penitent, and the triumph of Ormusd be universal and complete.

* The reader of the Classics, who has so often found in them descriptions or references to the *four ages*, will naturally be led to inquire, whether there is not some close affinity, as to origin, between them and the four great periods of Zoroaster. Many resemblances may easily be found. The great period, moreover, of the 12,000 years—may not this correspond with Virgil's *magni menses* in Ec. IV, and with the *magnus annus* of Servius, who comments on the passage in Virgil? More light will yet be thrown on some of these matters.

in some respects approached very near to those in the Bible. It is no objection to *scriptural* morality, that Socrates, Plato, Xenophon, Plutarch, Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus, and many others, cherished not a few right notions respecting morality. Nor is it any proof against the inspiration of the Scriptures, that many doctrines of natural theology, (so to speak), are *assumed* by the sacred writers, instead of being formally proved by them, or established by mere dint of authority. Even the existence of the Godhead itself is everywhere *assumed*, and nowhere demonstrated by argument.

Why may we not say, then, that the hope which is strengthened and made sure by the Apocalypse, the hope that the reign of sin and sorrow will finally cease and the triumph of holiness and happiness be complete, is not to be considered as merely and only a natural principle of the human heart adorned by ingenious fiction, and presented as such in this book because such hope is congenial with our nature? That it is *congenial*, may be fully conceded. But from the very fact, that there is such a principle implanted in our breasts, I would argue, that the great Author of our nature has caused such a book as the Apocalypse to be written; for by it the wants which spring from the natural desire of deliverance from evil may be fully satisfied. The book now presents a consolation the need of which we feel. It is adapted to our case. And how can this be turned into a legitimate argument against its high origin and authority?

From a survey of the Scriptures in general, and of some prevalent views in the heathen world, we now venture to say, that John has not produced, in the Apocalypse, any important doctrine which is wholly new or strange, and therefore incredible. His book cannot be rejected on such a ground, by any intelligent or candid reader. The world was filled with hopes, more or less distinct, of a nature like to those encouraged and rendered sure by the Apocalypse, at the time when this book was written. It was doubtless no matter of surprise to the Christians who were contemporary with the author, to find in the Revelation the leading truths which it inculcates. Ages and generations had hoped and sighed for deliverance from sin and sorrow. The work of John opened and made bright the prospect of realizing what had so long been desired. His style and manner, the costume of his book, many of his symbols, his plan and mode of development, were in some respects new, certainly very striking. But the churches of early times do not seem to have thought that the Revelation was either so peculiar or so obscure, that it ought to be rejected from a place among the sacred books. When modern critics have thought and reasoned in this way, have they not displayed some want of proper attention to the history of opinions that belong to the early ages of Christianity?

§ 4. *Estimation in which the apocalyptic style of prophecy was held, at the time when the Revelation was composed.*

Whoever reads with care the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the Messianic reign, and the future prosperity and glory of the church—such as have been offered to the view of the reader in a preceding section of this work—can scarcely fail to observe how gradually the *manner* of them is changed, while the *matter* or substantial basis of them remains still the same. Nothing can be more general and brief than the first annunciations. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." "Shiloh shall come, and unto him the gathering of the people shall be." "In Abraham's seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Who the individual deliverer was to be; what his office or condition; when or where he should make his appearance; by what means he was to become a blessing to all nations as well as to the Jews; all these and other things of a similar nature were held as yet in reserve. It was only down so late as the time of David, when the intimation was plainly given, that the expected Deliverer and King would spring from his progeny. David, therefore, in prophetic anticipation of what was to take place, exhibited him before the public eye as an all-powerful King, an irresistible Conqueror, whose reign would be universal, and fill the earth with blessings. Other writers, of the same age and of succeeding times, animated with the like spirit, re-echoed the strains of this immortal bard, and widely proclaimed the victories of the King of kings and Lord of lords. The 45th Psalm, the ninth chapter of Isaiah, and other pieces of the like tenor, are striking examples of what I have just stated.

Among all the earlier prophetic annunciations respecting the future kingdom of heaven, however, none are to be found where *symbol* is employed in the manner in which Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, and the author of the Apocalypse employ it. *Figurative* language is, indeed, everywhere employed. From the very nature of the case, this was absolutely necessary; for how could an attractive picture of things in the distant future be drawn, without borrowing the costume of the age in which the prophetic author wrote? How could he form a picture both animated and striking, unless he addressed the imagination and fancy through the medium of imagery or tropical language? The second Psalm, the 45th Psalm, and most of the predictions in Isaiah, are notable examples of what I here mean to designate. No part of the Scriptures is more full of trope and imagery than these Messianic compositions; none requires more rhetorical discrimination and taste, in order to make a correct interpretation.

But with all this abundance of metaphor and animated imagery, how different still is the manner of these predictions, from the general tenor of those contained in the book of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah! I do not now speak merely of the Messianic predictions in these books, but of the general manner of the entire compositions of these prophets. From the time of the captivity downwards, the taste of the Hebrew writers in general seems to have undergone a great change. I know of nothing more dissimilar in respect to style and method, than Isaiah, for example, on the one side, and Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, on the other. Jeremiah is an example of a kind of intermediate tone between the two. But he was educated in Palestine, and spent most of his life there. His style exhibits some points of surpassing excellence, in regard to which he has not been outdone by any writer, perhaps never equalled. But his writings afford us only a few examples of the *symbolic* method of representation; such as those of the linen girdle, chap. xiii; the potter and his marred work, chap. xviii; the potter's earthen bottle, chap. xix; the two baskets of figs, chap. xxiv; and the bonds and yoke put on his neck, chap. xxvii. In Isaiah, I find but a single instance of a similar nature; (unless indeed we add to this the representation in chap. viii.) This is in chap. xx, where the prophet is commanded "to walk naked and barefoot for the space of three years." I do not understand this, however, as anything more than an *emblematic picture* exhibited indeed in language, but not literally carried through in action. Still, in its nature it is symbolic. In the same manner I understand the symbolic transaction exhibited in Hosea i, ii. Amos has one example of symbol also, in chap. viii, viz. a basket of summer fruit.

Let the reader pass now from an attentive examination of these early prophets, to the careful perusal of those who wrote during and after the Babylonish exile. Ezekiel, from beginning to end, is almost an unbroken series of symbolical representation. His preaching or prophesying stands, in almost every case, connected intimately with representations of such a nature.

The book of Daniel is, if we except a little of it which is occupied with historic narrative, *nothing but symbol* from beginning to end. Dreams, visions, sensible representations, in which that is acted out, in view of the prophet, which he is to record as a prediction, constitute the whole of his prophecies. In these respects, he is the exemplar of the Apocalypse, whose author, although indeed no imitator in a servile sense of any other writer, would seem still to have given a decided preference to Daniel's method of representation above that of other prophets.

The book of Zechariah, again, is one continuous strain of symbols, until we reach chap. vii; this, with chap. viii, resembles very much the

manner of Haggai and Malachi, his contemporaries. From the 9th chap. to the end, the strain is indeed diverse; so much so, that critics have been and are still divided in opinion, whether this portion of the book belongs to the same author who wrote the first half of the book. Without entering into this dispute, I would merely remark, that the subject of the last part of the book is so very diverse from that of the first, that we might reasonably expect a different mode of treating it. But, with all the diversity between chap. ix—xiv. and the rest of the book, still chap xi. furnishes us with a notable example of teaching by the use of symbol; as marked, indeed, as any in the preceding part of the book.

In the brief compositions of Haggai and Malachi, symbol does not occur; but both of their books are merely *hortatory* or *admonitory*, rather than predictions respecting the future.

Here then are plain and palpable *facts* before us. A great change took place in the prophetic style and method, from and after the date of the Jewish captivity. Jeremiah presents this matter to us, in its transition-state; which is what we might naturally expect. Ezekiel, who is carried into a *foreign* country when young, fully adopts the method of the prophets during and after the exile. The taste for this mode of writing, introduced by such men as Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, seems to have been widely diffused among the Jews everywhere, and to have come down, with augmented sway, to the apostolic age and the times which immediately succeeded it. This we shall have abundant opportunity to see, in the sequel.

In whatever way so great a change in the style of composition was brought about among the Jewish prophets, yet the fact itself admits of no denial or concealment. The taste of writers and readers certainly underwent a great revolution. Did the influence of the Chaldees upon the Jews effect this? Or is it one of those things which supervene so gradually, that a specific cause can hardly be assigned for it? Is it, for example, like the change in English style and taste, since the days of Addison, Steele, and Pope?

That theory of inspiration which makes men mere machines while under its influence, responding to the touch of an invisible hand, as the lyre does to the touch of its master, can hardly find admission here. According to this account of prophecy, here was in all respects the same author, who guided Isaiah, and Hosea, and Amos, and Joel, and Micah. But nothing can be more diverse than the manner in which he spoke by them, and that in which he spoke during and after the exile. Can we venture to suggest, that the taste of the divine Author himself became changed in the course of time, in order that we may account for the phenomenon before us? The bare suggestion of such a thing makes us instinctively revolt from it. Shall we not say, then, as Paul does, that

"the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets;" and inasmuch as this is so, all the individualities of character, in each age, and in each particular prophet, are of course fully developed? If *facts* may be permitted to bear testimony on this occasion, (and why not?) we must say, that the latter supposition is probably true. Diversities greater, more specific, more easily pointed out, and more characteristic of difference in taste and cultivation, exist nowhere among Greek, Roman, or English writers, than exist among the writers of the Old Testament prophecies.

If one wanted proof of the almost self-evident maxim, that *when God speaks to men he speaks more humano*, he might find it in the facts before us. Why does Ezekiel differ so much from Isaiah, Hosea, Joel, and others of an earlier age? Because, I would answer, his own personal taste, and that of others whom he addresses, was exceedingly different from the taste of former times. It matters not from what cause this difference sprung. As a *fact* it stands out in relief before us; and we proceed in a correct manner, therefore, when we attribute to it all the influence that it would naturally have.

The question is of little or no moment here, which of the two methods of writing now under consideration, is *rhetorically* to be preferred. In the West, no doubt Isaiah would bear away the palm. But there is an East as well as a West, in a world so large as ours; and there cannot be a shadow of doubt, that Ezekiel and Daniel would carry the prize in all the eastern world. Much nearer to their taste do these authors approach, than the simple and sublime Isaiah. What rational objection can be made, now, that a book, such as the Bible, intended for all the nations of the earth, should exhibit on its pages such a variety of method in composition, that every part of the world may find in it something adapted to its own taste?

What I have now said may serve to explain, and at the same time defend, the style and manner of the Apocalypse, which so nearly, in many respects, resembles that of the later Hebrew prophets. The taste of the later prophets was widely extended and long continued among the Jews. In its nature it is more truly *oriental*, than that of the earlier prophets. As the greater portion of the Jews never returned from exile, but remained in distant eastern countries, no wonder that they continued to relish in a peculiar manner the symbolic method of writing, exhibited by the later prophets, and that this taste came down to the time of the Saviour and his apostles.

It is enough to say, in the way of defending the style of the Apocalypse, if such defence were needed, that John complied with the demands of the time in which he lived with regard to this. And if it should be said here, that the Saviour himself and Paul did not employ the symbolic method in their predictions; it should be remembered, that the *prophetic*

declarations of both are exceedingly brief, rarely comprising more than a few sentences, and in declarations of such a character there is not room for composition of such a nature as John exhibits. But the reader should also call to mind the exceedingly figurative, I might even say *symbolic*, description of the Saviour's coming to punish the Jews, as set forth in Matt. xxiv. I would remind him, also, that every part of our Saviour's instructions is filled with *parables* and *similitudes;* a method of speaking altogether of the like nature with that of using symbol in prophecy.

It will be admitted, on all hands, that it is important for an interpreter of any particular book of Scriptures, to gain all the knowledge which he can of the taste and manners of the age in which the author of that book lived. Whoever was the author of the Apocalypse, there can be no rational doubt that the book itself was written during the first century of the Christian era. Was the author alone and peculiar in his taste? Was he so singular, so peculiar in the method of his composition, as to offend the feelings and taste of his contemporaries, and expose his book to be charged by his readers with being extravagant and unintelligible? So one would think from the charges which in *recent* times have been often made against the book, and which are not without example, even during and after the latter part of the third century. There have not been wanting critics, indeed, such as they were, who have more than intimated that the writer of the Apocalypse was a kind of enthusiastic visionary, agitated, when he wrote his book, by a species of *monomania* springing from the troubles and persecutions of the times in which he lived. It is thus that ignorance or misconception of the true nature of this work can speak; but it becomes those who have examined this matter, to consider well whether there is any weight in allegations of such a character.

My position is, that *the taste and manner of the Apocalypse is the taste and manner of the later Hebrew prophets, and of the age in which John himself lived.* The former part of this allegation has already been illustrated and confirmed. It remains to exhibit, if it can be done, the truth of the latter.

Fortunately for my purpose, there are a number of compositions still extant, which took their rise during the first century or near the close of it, and which either lay claim to a prophetic character, or evidently exhibit, in their style and method, an attempt to imitate the symbolic or apocalyptic mode of writing. From these we can judge *what the taste and feelings of that period was,* in regard to composition of this nature; for nothing can be plainer, than that writers, who were desirous of being read, would not knowingly offend against the taste of the age in which they lived. It is evident, indeed, from the first reading of the pieces in

question, that the *apocalyptic* manner of writing was one which was considered as specially agreeable to the taste of the times, and one which would easily find its way to popular favour.

In giving some account of the ancient apocalyptic literature, which is of an *apocryphal* nature, for the purpose of illustrating the spirit of the age in which John lived, I shall divide it into two classes; viz. (1) Such books as are not known to be extant at present, but which are mentioned by ancient writers. (2) Such works as, either in whole or in part, in a translation or in their original language, have come down to us.

I have named all the books of this nature APOCRYPHAL; and by this designation I mean to characterize them, (1) As not belonging to the Christian canon of sacred books; and (2) As containing ungrounded pretences to the spirit of prophecy, and exhibiting by their manner and matter more or less of fanaticism, empty auguries, idle speculations, vain boastings of revealed scientific knowledge, mere histories of the past clothed in the garb of *predictions*, and assumptions of very extraordinary communications made in a manner not only supernatural, but not unfrequently in a way that is extravagant, childish, and altogether incredible. With all these is intermixed many fine *moral* and sometimes truly *Christian* sentiments, and many views of God and divine things which have their origin in the Scriptures. It will be understood of course, that I do not here undertake to characterize the works of the Hebrew prophets named above, but only such later apocryphal books as we now have opportunity to examine. Other apocryphal works which have perished, if we may judge from the few specimens of them that have been preserved, and from the fate itself which they have experienced, were for the most part inferior to those which still remain. The *virtuoso* in ancient sacred literature is probably, therefore, the only person that now suffers any serious inconvenience worth naming, from the loss to which I refer. Still, the reader will remember, that a leading object before us at present is to inquire, whether the age of John was an age productive in an uncommon degree of compositions which were designed to be of an apocalyptic nature; and if so, whether there is anything strange in the fact, that John has made use of that method of developing his prophetic views which the Apocalypse exhibits?

§ 5. *Apocryphal Apocalypses which are not known to be now extant.*

It will be understood by the reader, that the great antiquity of all these is not asserted; because the means of investigating the question of *age*, are not in all cases within our power. In general we may with much probability believe them to have been the productions of quite an early age of Christianity, although not, perhaps, of the first century,

I shall simply recount such of these books as are known by their titles, and refer the reader to authors where he will find some description of them.

(1) *The Apocalypse of Elijah.* (2) *The Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (*Σοφονίου*). (3) *The Apocalypse of Zechariah.*

These are all mentioned as books that have perished, in the Codex Biblioth. Coisl. vel Seguir. ed. Montfaucon, p. 194. Jerome also mentions the first, Epist. 101, ad Pammach. From their titles we should naturally suppose them to have been *apocalyptic* in the manner of some of the Old Testament prophets. But we can make no certain conclusion.

(4) *The Apocalypse of Adam.* This is mentioned in Epiph. Haer. 31. 8, as being a Gnostic production.

(5) *The Apocalypse of Abraham.* Also mentioned by the same author, Haer. 39. 5, and attributed to the Sethites. It is called *Abraham*, in Pseudo-Athanas. Synopsis Scrip. Sac.

(6) *The Apocalypse of Moses.* Mentioned by Syncellus, Chronogr. p. 27, and supposed by him, and Cedrenus (comp. Histor. p. 3), to be the same with the book entitled *λεπτὴ Μωσέως γένεσις*.

(7) *The Prophecies of Hystaspes.* This book must have been composed very early, inasmuch as Justin Martyr (Apol. Maj. § 20) mentions it as according, in its matter, with the Sibylline oracles. It appears not only to have been well known among the early Christians, but Clemens Alex. (Strom vi. 5) quotes from an *apocryphal writing of the apostle Paul*, extant in his time but not particularly described by him, a passage which shows in what estimation it was held by some. The writer of that Apocrypha, Clement says, asserts that Paul not only recommended the Sibylline oracles to the heathen, but also the work of Hystaspes; in which last work they might find (as he alleges), that "the Son of God is more gloriously and clearly described [than in the Sibylline oracles], and also how that many kings will make war against Christ, hating him and those who bear his name, and his faithful followers, and his patience, and his coming." The book, therefore, would seem to have been of *Christian* origin; while at the same time it was, according to the testimony of Lactantius (Inst. vii. 15. vii. 18), of a like tenor with the Sibylline oracles, often approaching the manner of heathen predictions. The eschatology of Zoroaster, viz. that the world would perish by fire, etc., appears to have been adopted by the author of the book; who probably, therefore, was some oriental Christian, or Jewish Christian. Bleek (Theol. Zeitschrift. I. p. 146) supposes the apocryphal writing of Paul, mentioned above, to have been composed in the first century. Of course, if this be correct, the book of Hystaspes must be assigned to an early period.

(8) *The Apocalypse of Peter.* Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. III. 3. 25)

makes mention of this, and ranks it with other writings of a similar nature, which he explicitly declares to be spurious. But Clement of Alexandria, in one of his Hypotyposes, (which is now lost, but a fragment of which is found in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 14), makes mention of the Apocalypse of Peter, and ranks it with the doubted Epistles of Jude and Barnabas. Before the time of Clement, Theodotus the Gnostic had made free use of this Apocalypse; and in his *Ἐκλογαὶ ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν Θεοδότου*, the same Clement has preserved some small specimens of the Apocalypse in question. The tenor of these is that of heavy denunciation, probably directed against the Jews. In accordance with this view of the writing before us, Lactantius speaks in Inst. IV. 21, where he says that the *praedicatio* of Paul and of Peter at Rome was reduced to writing, and then cites from this writing many severe comminations against the Jews. It is doubtful, however, whether this *praedicatio* here means the *Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου*; although Grabe and Schmidt maintain this. It may have been the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, to which matter of this kind would not have been inappropriate.—But be this as it may, the anonymous fragment on the Canon in Muratori (Antiq. Ital. Med. Aevi, III. 854), who wrote near the end of the second century or at the beginning of the third, says: "Apocalypsis [*-is*=εις?] Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt." This writer, then, places the Apocalypse of Peter in the same rank with that of John; and so Clement of Alexandria appears to have done. Sozomen also states, that it was read *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς παρασκευῆς*, in some of the churches of Palestine, down to the fifth century. It was in all probability, then, of Judaeo-Christian origin, and in its tenor it was like many other productions of that period which had a similar origin. The extent of the writing cannot be known with certainty. In the *stichometria*, i. e. measure or number of *στίχοι*, pertaining to the various sacred and to some apocryphal books, given in Cotel. Patt. Apostol. I. p. 7, 2070 *στίχοι* are assigned to it by one reading, and by another 270. To the Apocalypse of John is assigned, in the same place, 1200.

(9) *The Apocalypse of Paul.* This was founded on the passage in 2 Cor. 12: 2—4, respecting Paul's rapture into the third heaven, and it professes to reveal what was there said to him. It was probably the same writing that was often cited in ancient times under the title of *Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου*. Augustine (Tract. 98 in Evang. Johannis) says, that it was "full of fables invented *stultissima presumptione*." The Cainitae, an anti-Jewish sect and a branch of the Ophitae, appear to have made great use of this writing. Sozomen refers to it in Ecc. Hist. VII. 19; as do Theodoret and Theophylact in their commentaries on 2 Cor. 12: 2—4. Theodosius of Alexandria, of an uncertain age, in his work

Ἐρωτήματα περὶ προσῳδιῶν, speaks of it as being no work of Paul the apostle, but of Paul of Samosata; which last, however, seems to be merely conjectural.

(10) *Revelations of Cerinthus.* A question much contested has arisen, in modern times, respecting these Revelations. The question is, whether a book bearing such a title in ancient times, and being the work of Cerinthus, really existed; or, whether the Apocalypse of John was so called by Caius, a presbyter at Rome (fl. A. D. 200), because he supposed Cerinthus to have been the author. Caius was a zealous opposer of the Montanists, who maintained extravagant views in respect to a terrestrial Millennium; and in a Dialogue written by him against the Montanists, he says, as quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. 3. 28, "Cerinthus, under the guise of revelations written by a distinguished apostle, has, without regard to truth, introduced to us accounts of wonderful things as shown to him by angels, affirming that after the resurrection there will be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that we shall be made citizens of Jerusalem in our fleshly state, and there serve once more our lusts and pleasures. And being an enemy to the Scriptures of God, and wishing to mislead, he says there will be a thousand years of wedding-feasts." Does Caius here mean, that Cerinthus himself forged revelations which resembled those of John, and prefixed the apostle's name to them in order to gain credit for them? Or does he mean to stigmatize the Apocalypse itself as a supposititious work, attributed to John by Cerinthus, and unworthy of credit? This is not the proper place for a discussion of this question, as it will again come up for consideration in the sequel. I will therefore simply remark here, that Eusebius nowhere mentions a book of this nature which was written by Cerinthus himself, although he says much of him, and is very particular in naming all works of such a kind which had come to his knowledge. Neither does Irenaeus nor Epiphanius make any mention of such a work as belonging to Cerinthus. The probability seems rather to be, that Caius, out of zeal against the Montanists and Cerinthus, who were enthusiastic Millenarians, meant by this passage to disclaim the Apocalypse of John because it seemed to him too much to favour their cause. He of course attributed the book to some factitious source, and maintained that deception was practised by Cerinthus in respect to it.

(11) *The Apocalypse of Saint Thomas.* Merely mentioned in the *Decretum Gelasianum de libris Apocryphis.* Also,

(12) *The Apocalypse of Stephen the Martyr.* Sixtus Senensis, in his Biblioth. Sac. II. p. 12, quotes a writing of Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees, as saying, that they held this Apocalypse in high estimation. Nothing more is known respecting it. The Greek original of Serapion remains as yet unpublished.

Later Apocalypses in abundance might be named; but this would have no bearing on the object before us; which is, *merely to illustrate the strong inclination of the early ages of Christianity toward writings of this nature.* We see what abundant gleanings have already been made, from writings which are mostly of early origin, and perhaps all of them; but which have perished, through their extravagance or insignificance. In regard to some others yet to be mentioned, we are placed in a different position. We have them before us, and can examine and judge for ourselves respecting the nature and design of their composition. I shall give the result of my examination as briefly as is consistent with imparting the requisite information to those who may have no access to the originals, and who wish for such an account of them as will enable them to form some proper judgment of the books in question.*

§ 6. *Apocryphal Revelations still extant.*

These are (*a*) The Ascension of Isaiah the Prophet. (*b*) The Book of Enoch. (*c*) The fourth Book of Ezra. (*d*) The Sibylline Oracles. (*e*) The Testament of the twelve Patriarchs. (*f*) The Shepherd of Hermas. (*g*) The apocryphal Apocalypse of John.

(a) The Ascension of Isaiah the Prophet.

Such is the general title given to a singular book, of no small interest to the critic who is concerned with Christian antiquities. Several of the early Christian writers have referred to this production; and some have quoted a part of its contents in such a way, as to show that it was originally written in Greek. From the sixth century, however, nearly down to the present time, with the exception of only now and then a solitary voice, a deep silence has reigned among ecclesiastical writers of all classes respecting it; and it is but a few years since, that the learned counted it among the books which were irretrievably lost. Happily, a little more than 20 years ago, Dr. Laurence, then Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, came into possession of an Aethiopic translation of this work, which he procured from a bookseller in London, who had purchased it among a parcel of miscellaneous books at auction, without any knowledge as to whence it came or what it contained. In 1819 Dr. Laurence gave to the world the contents of it, in Aethiopic, and in a Latin translation with notes, to which he subjoined an English version,

* For the substance of the preceding summary respecting the lost Ἀποκαλύψεις, I am indebted to the interesting work of F. Lücke, Einl. in die Off. Johannis, I. p. 44 seq. It is more complete and better arranged, than any other which I have seen.

and a critical dissertation in the same language. Of the general fidelity and ability of these critical labours, there is, I believe, no doubt among those who are qualified to judge.

The general title of the book, *Ascension of Isaiah*, or (as Epiphanius Haeres. 40 calls it) *Ἀναβατικὸν Ἐσαΐου*, does not seem to be appropriate to the whole composition. It is divided, by the nature of its contents and by the mode in which it is written, into two parts; the first of which (chap. i—v.) is a kind of short biographical sketch of the prophet Isaiah; and the second (chap. vi—xi.) contains an account of his ascent to the upper heaven. There is a separate title for the second part, viz. *The* VISION (*ὅρασις*) *which Isaiah the son of Amos saw, in the 20th year of the reign of Hezekiah king of Judah.* A brief view of the contents of this peculiar and interesting piece, will not be unacceptable to the reader who is not able to procure the book. It is, moreover, of some importance to the accomplishment of the object which I have in view. Its general similarity of form to the Apocalypse of John must, in many respects, be evident to every intelligent reader. The tenor of the book is as follows:

'Hezekiah, in the 26th year of his reign, sent for his only son Manasseh, and brought him before the prophet Isaiah and his son Josheb, in order that he might deliver to him the truths, which he himself had received from the prophet, respecting eternal judgments, the torments of Gehenna that place of everlasting punishment, the different orders of angels—and truths relating to the faith of the Beloved [the Messiah], the destruction of the world, the clothing of the saints, their departure and change, and the rejection and ascension of the Beloved. These truths, [it is said], were seen in prophetic vision by Isaiah in the 20th year of Hezekiah's reign.' [These subjects have respect to the contents of the second part of the book entitled *Vision* or *Ὅρασις*, viz. chap. vi—xi.]

'Isaiah informs the king that his son will reject all these truths; that Samael [Satan] will take possession of him, and lead him to pervert many, and also to the murder of the prophet himself. Hezekiah weeps, and determines to destroy Manasseh; but the prophet forbids him.' Ch. i.

'After Hezekiah's death, Berial [Belial = Satan] leads Manasseh into all manner of wickedness, specially idolatry and the persecution of the faithful servants of God. Isaiah, with other prophets, flees from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and they take up their abode on a desert mountain there, where they subsist on roots and herbs. After two years, a false prophet by the name of Belkira, a Samaritan residing at Bethlehem, discovering the place of Isaiah's retreat, accuses him to Manasseh as being guilty of blasphemy in asserting that he had seen God [Is. vi.], also because he had called Jerusalem Sodom, and denounced her princes as people of Gomorrha, [Is. 1: 10]. Manasseh sends and apprehends Isaiah; for Berial (who dwelt in him) was greatly enraged on account of his prophecies respecting the Beloved,' [viz. those mentioned under chap. i.]

After narrating the apprehension of Isaiah, on account of the predictions which he had before uttered concerning the Beloved, who would come from the seventh heaven, take the form of man, be persecuted by

the Jews, and finally crucified "in company with the workers of iniquity," the writer goes on to recite more particulars of the prophecy of Isaiah."

'The twelve apostles take offence, watchmen guard the sepulchre of the Beloved, angels descend to open it on the third day, the twelve disciples are commissioned to preach to all nations, the Holy Spirit is given and miracles become frequent. Afterwards, however, disciples forsake the doctrine of the twelve apostles *respecting the second advent of Christ, and contend much about the proximity of his approach.* There will be great defections in doctrine and practice, among pastors, elders, and their flocks; but few faithful teachers will be left, and a lying, worldly, ambitious, avaricious spirit will prevail.' [The reader will not fail to notice how plainly these things characterize the time in which the writer must have lived.] Chap. ii. iii.

'When this period is completed, Berial will *descend* [viz. from the firmament or upper regions of the atmosphere, in which the author supposes him to live], in the form of an impious monarch, *the murderer of his mother*, the sovereign of the world, [he means *Nero* who murdered his own mother], and he will persecute and oppress all the disciples of the Beloved, claim divine honours, overturn all the usual and established courses of things, be worshipped and served as God, erect his image everywhere, *and have power three years, seven months, and twenty-seven days.* Only a few believers will be left, waiting for the coming of their Lord; which shall take place after 332 days. *Berial and his powers shall be dragged into Gehenna, and the saints shall enjoy the rest provided for them in their present bodily state.* All the saints from heaven, in their heavenly clothing, shall descend with the Lord, and dwell in this world; while the saints, who had not died, shall also be clothed in like manner with those who come from heaven, and, after a time, leave their bodies here, in order to assume their heavenly station. The universal wreck of the material world will follow; and this will be the forerunner of the general resurrection and the judgment. The ungodly shall be devoured by fire which issues from the Beloved.' Chap. iv.

The writer now breaks off from his account of Isaiah's prophecy, and refers us, for the remainder, to the *Vision of Babylon;* by which I understand a part of the *canonical* Isaiah, viz. chap. xiii. xiv. xxi. He evidently expects his readers to find there a type or exemplar of the punishment of the second Babylon [Rome], with all its adherents.

Chap. v. contains an account of the final martyrdom of the prophet, 'who was sawn asunder, through the influence of Berial, with a wooden saw. Belkira, the Samaritan, and others stood by, now deriding his sufferings, and then endeavoring to persuade him to recant what he had said against them. But he hearkened not to their counsels, and died without a tear or a groan, calling upon the Holy Spirit. All this was brought about by Samael [Satan], who was enraged because of Isaiah's prophecy respecting the Beloved, and also respecting the destruction of Satan and his kingdom.'

It cannot have escaped the reader's notice, how entirely the general tenor of the foregoing alleged predictions of Isaiah accord with the latter part of the Apocalypse. But of this, more in the sequel.

Here ends the first part of the Ascension of Isaiah; and, from its contents, it might with much more propriety be named ἔξοδος or μαρτύριον

Ἐσαΐου. But it would seem, that some redactor who gave currency to the work, affixed a *general* title, because the first part might be fairly considered as nothing more than an *introduction* to the second. The abstract of the Ὅρασις must be very brief.

'Isaiah, with his son Josheb, visits Hezekiah in the 20th year of his reign; and thirty prophets, with many sons of the prophets, were also assembled on this occasion, in order to listen to the distinguished seer. The voice of the Holy Spirit [בת קל] is soon heard, while Isaiah is talking with the king; and all fall prostrate and worship. Isaiah remains in a trance, conversing with the Holy Spirit. One of the glorious angels of the seventh heaven is sent, to conduct Isaiah thither. When the rapture was accomplished, and the prophet restored to the use of his bodily faculties again, he related the particulars of his ascension to the king and some of his officers with the prophets.' Chap. vi.

The vision during the rapture follows. 'An angel exceedingly glorious appears to him, and informs him that he is sent to conduct him into the presence of God and of the Beloved. First, they ascend to the firmament [the upper part of the air, i. e. that which lies near the welkin or firmament]. There the prophet sees Samael and all his powers engaged in fierce contest, and slaughter, and diabolical deeds, doing things like to those which are done on earth.' [Another trait of Nero's time].

He then ascends above the first heaven or firmament, where he sees a throne in the midst, with angels on the right and on the left, the former being far more glorious than the latter, while all unite in praising Him who dwells in the seventh heaven, and his Beloved. The second heaven repeats the same scene, but with augmented splendour. Here the prophet prostrates himself in order to worship Him who sits upon the throne; but he is told by his conductor that it is only an angel, and that he must reserve his worship for the seventh heaven; [comp. Rev. 19: 10. 22: 9.]

'In the third, the fourth, and the fifth heaven, the same scene is repeated; the throne in the midst, the angels on the right and left, and the gradually augmenting glory are all mentioned. In the third heaven, however, the commemoration of things ceases, although the knowledge of them there exists. The glory of the presiding angel in each of the five heavens, is greater than that of the angels on the right and left. In the fifth heaven, the augmentation of glory is tripled or quadrupled.' Chap. vii.

'The prophet is next conducted to the ether of the sixth heaven, where he sees a throne and great splendour. The angel informs him, that he is to see much greater glory, and that he is to return for a while to his mortal body, but afterwards by a violent death to come to the seventh heaven, and assume the clothing there laid up for him. In the sixth heaven, to which he is now conducted, he sees no throne, no right nor left side differing in splendour; all are alike splendid, and "*all invoke the Father, the Beloved the Christ, and the Holy Spirit, all with united voice.*" Here the light is such as makes that of the five heavens appear as darkness. The prophet prays for liberty to remain here and not return to the earth; but his request is not granted.' Chap. viii.

'He is next transported to the ether of the seventh heaven. There a voice salutes his ear, inquiring whither he would come who dwells among strangers. Permission, however, is given by his "Lord God, the Lord Christ," to ascend to the seventh heaven. There are angels innumerable, and all the glorified saints invested with their heavenly clothing, but not yet crowned or enthroned, nor to

be so until after the humiliation, exaltation, and glorified state of the Beloved. The beloved is to descend through all heavens, unknown to the angels as he passes, because he assumes their respective forms, [chap. x. 20 seq.]; he will assume the form of man, be *reputed* as flesh, be crucified, rise from the dead on the third day, and after 545 days ascend to glory, bringing many saints with him; and then shall thrones and crowns be given to them all. Books recording all that is done on earth are here shown to the prophet, and clothing, crowns, and thrones are pointed out, which are reserved for saints who are in future to come thither. The Beloved here exhibits himself in surpassing glory. Angels and saints worship him. He then assumes an *angelic* form; they still repeat the worship. Another glorious Being, the Angel of the Holy Spirit, of similar appearance, is approached and worshipped, although he does not actually change his glory into one like that of the angels. The prophet is bidden to worship him. Finally, the Beloved, the angel of the Holy Spirit, and all the saints and angels, approach and worship the Father.' Chap. ix.

'The prophet now hears praise and glorification transmitted from all the six heavens below to Him who is in the seventh; after which a voice proceeds from the Father, commissioning the Beloved to descend through all the heavens, concealed from the inhabitants of them. In passing through the domain of Samael, he is even to assume the appearance of his angels [10: 11]. When the conquest of all the powers of darkness shall have been achieved, then shall the Beloved ascend to glory, and reign at the right hand of God.' 'In obedience to this mandate the Lord now descends through all heavens, accompanied by the prophet and his conductor, and concealed from all those through the midst of whom he passes. He even assimilates himself to the angels of Samael, as he passes through the firmament where they dwell.' Chap. x.

'Next he becomes incarnate in the womb of Mary. The suspicions of Joseph, his intention to divorce her, the interposition of an angel, the refraining from conjugal intercourse, and the miraculous birth of the Saviour, are all then narrated as passing in vision before the prophet's eyes. His youth, manhood, miracles, public development, crucifixion, the sending forth of his apostles, and his ascension, are all briefly passed in review. Finally he ascends in his glory, and is seen and worshipped in his ascent by all the worlds through which he passes, not excepting even that of Samael. In the seventh heaven, he takes his seat at the right hand of the great Glory, and the Holy Spirit on the left hand.'

'Isaiah now returns to his mortal body, and relates to Hezekiah and others what things he had seen, charging them not to make them public until a future period. On account of this vision Samael hated Isaiah, and caused Manasseh to saw him asunder.' Chap. xi.

Such is the deeply interesting apocryphal book before us; on which it would be easier to write a little volume, than to compress into a few paragraphs what is appropriate to be said on the present occasion.

Of the individual author of this piece we know nothing with certainty, or even with probability. That he was a *Christian*, lies upon the face of the whole composition; that he was of *Jewish* lineage, is almost equally plain, from his manifest acquaintance with the ancient Scriptures, and with the Rabbinical traditions of the times. As an example of the latter, we may appeal to the martyrology of Isaiah as related in chap. 5: 11, where the circumstance is mentioned of his being *sawn asunder*

(as Dr. Laurence has it) *with a wooden saw*. The meaning probably is, as we should express it, *with a wood-saw*, i. e. a saw adapted to the sawing of wood. Merely that he was sawn asunder, is the tradition given in the Mishna (Tract. Jebam. IV. ad fin.); so too in Cod. Sanhed. fol. 103. b; and in some other Jewish productions, early and late, as well as in some of the earlier Christian fathers who make mention of the same tradition. Paul is supposed by many to refer to the same, in the ἐπρίσθησαν of Heb. 11: 37.

To recount the instances in which the author makes reference to Old and New Testament declarations of facts and truths, would be to repeat a considerable portion of the whole book; although in no instance does he *formally* quote either Testament, if perhaps we may except ch. viii. 11, where it is said of Isaiah in his earthly condition, that "he had neither perceived, nor ascended, nor understood the things" which were revealed to him in the upper world. The same turn of thought, and nearly the same expression, may be found in Is. 64: 3, 4. But the whole tenor of the work is most manifestly modelled after portions of the Old and New Testaments. The rapture of Paul to the third heaven, (2 Cor. xii.), is the model of the general costume of the book; and in the execution of the author's plan, the visions of God in Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Apocalypse, are all laid under contribution. That he had read the Apocalypse, seems to me almost beyond a doubt. E. g. Isaiah says (Ascens. 8: 4) to his angel-conductor: "What is this which I behold, my Lord? He replied: I am not thy Lord, but thine associate." Here it is very natural to suppose, that Rev. 22: 8, 9 or 19: 10 was before the author's mind. On another occasion (7: 21—23) the prophet falls down to worship the angel, who replies to him almost according to the exact tenor of Rev. 19: 10, where John offers to worship his angel-interpreter. The description of "the impious monarch, the murderer of his mother" (4: 2—12), seems so plainly to coincide, in all its leading features, with that of the beast in Apoc. xiii, that the reader cannot make a comparison between them without a conviction that one must be the model of the other.

The leading sentiment which lies at the basis of the Apocalypse, and which has already been exhibited above, is almost with equal plainness brought to view in the Ascension of Isaiah. According to chap. 4: 13 seq., great defection in the church shall take place before the coming of Christ; but he will come with his angels, and "drag Berial and his powers into Gehenna;" comp. Rev. 20: 1—3. Then will succeed a time of rest to the pious; comp. Rev. 20: 4—6. The saints in glory will come with their heavenly splendour, and dwell with the saints on earth, who will be clad like the glorified saints; and after the season of rest is past, they will be transferred to heaven (Ascens. IV. 16, 17). Then

all worlds will be shaken by the indignation of the Lord, the resurrection will take place, the judgment will follow, and a fire will consume all the ungodly (4: 18).

From this passage it is plain, that the author of the apocryphal book under examination was a Millenarian in the sense in which Papias and many of the early Christians were, i. e. that he believed in Christ's *visible* reign on earth, during the period of rest which he had appointed for his church.

In another passage (9: 12—18), the writer refers to the state of saints after their death and before the ascension of Christ, in a manner which shows that he had the first portion of the Apocalypse (chap. iii—vii.) in view. He speaks of the thrones, and crowns, and the heavenly clothing, in a way like that of John in the Apocalypse 3: 4. 4: 4. 6: 11. 7: 9, 13; one circumstance excepted, of which I shall say more in the sequel.

Gesenius (Einleit. in Jesaiam, p. 50) does not hesitate to say, that 'the main object of the writer of the *Ascension* is, to express his earnest hope and expectation of the speedy coming of Christ, and of the splendid triumph for the saints and martyrs which will ensue.' That this doctrine is plainly contained in his book, the passages quoted above are sufficient to show. But these passages are the principal ones to which appeal can be made. Occasional and subordinate allusions to the same topics are indeed not wanting in the Ascension; but the plan of the writer is not *simplex duntaxat et unum*, like that of John in the Apocalypse. The book of Daniel was probably before the eye of his mind, as well as the Apocalypse; and the special costume of the Ascension in general approaches nearer to that of the Old Testament prophets, than to that of the New. This seems to betray the author's *Jewish* origin.

There are several limitations of *times* in this book which I cannot forbear noticing, as some of them are apparently connected with the time in which the book was written. In 9: 16, Christ's continuance on earth, after his resurrection and before his ascension, is said to be 545 days; at least this is apparently the meaning of the passage. This is so different from the forty days mentioned in Acts 1: 3, that no critic on the Ascension has yet been able to find a solution of the difficulty. Nitzsch, in some highly acute and critical remarks on the production before us, (Studien und Kritiken, III. p. 235), thinks it not improbable, that the writer means to include not only the time of the Saviour's sojourn with his apostles, but also the period in which he was engaged in subduing Samael and his angels who dwell in the upper atmosphere, before the Conqueror ascended into the heavens themselves. In the total absence of satisfactory *facts*, we may consent at least to hear ingenious conjecture.

In chap. 4: 12, the writer assigns to the persecuting power of Nero

the time of three years, seven months, and twenty-seven days. The burning of Rome was on the 19th of June, A. D. 64. The persecution set on foot by Nero against Christians, as the alleged authors of the conflagration, commenced probably in November of the same year. So Mosheim (De Rebus, etc.), who alleges reasons apparently satisfactory. Nero was destroyed on the 9th of June, A. D. 68. Counting back to November in A. D. 64, we find a space of three years and seven months; and if the persecution began quite early in November, A. D. 64, there will be some days over this time; which seems to be a striking coincidence.—But on the other hand, may not the writer have had in his eye the period assigned to the great persecutor of the church mentioned in Dan. 12: 12, viz. 1335 days? If the years be reckoned at 365 days, and three of the months at thirty, and four at thirty-one days, this will make the identical period mentioned in the Ascension, with the exception of only one day. It is difficult to decide in such a case, where either method of reckoning would seem to be satisfactory.

In 4: 14 of the Ascension, it is said, "the Lord shall come with his angels . . . to drag Berial and his powers into Gehenna, after 332 days," viz. from the end of Nero's reign as above described. Here is the portion of time on which Laurence fixes as the period within which the Ascension must have been written. *After* this period had elapsed, and Christ had not come as was expected, the writer could not have ventured on so bold an assertion. Of course, then, sometime during A. D. 69 must be the date to be assigned to the origin of the Ascension.

Yet with this, neither Gesenius, Bleek, Nitzsch, nor Lücke, appears to be satisfied. They regard the numbers in this work as merely *symbolical*, and are not, therefore, disposed to admit a literal construction. I cannot but think that their criticism is doubtful. There are other circumstances in the book, which they do not seem to have noticed, that fix the time of its composition to a very early age; I should say, to the first century. In 3: 21 seq. it is expressly stated, that great divisions and troubles shall arise in the church "upon the subject of his [Christ's] second advent . . . . and the proximity of his approach." Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians is a comment on this. Every person well acquainted with the early history of Christianity knows, that the latter half of the first century gave rise to many opinions and controversies on this subject, and that a very general expectation was indulged, for a time, that Christ would appear in his glory before the generation then living should pass away. Many of the German critics think they find such expectations fully and often expressed in every part of the New Testament. Now as all hopes of this nature must of course vanish with the first century, so no disputes on the point, *when* Christ would come, appear to have been seriously and extensively agitated after the close of

the first century. The Millenarians of subsequent periods were particularly concerned with the question of a *visible* reign; not so much, whether the reign would commence immediately after the death of Nero, or of Domitian; for that period was already passed. After the death of Nero, then, and before the expectation of Christ's *speedy* appearance was given up, must, as seems to my mind, be the period fixed upon as the probable date of the Ascension.

Gesenius objects to fixing upon an origin so early, that the doctrine of the *Trinity* is too prominent in the book, to render it probable that the Ascension could have been composed until a later period, when this doctrine was more fully developed. Laurence, on the other hand, glories in having found in the book irrefutable evidence of the early existence, even in the apostolic age itself, of the doctrine of the Trinity; Gen. Remarks, p. 111 seq. I cannot accede to the opinion of either. In Chap. 1: 7, the writer says, indeed: "As God liveth . . . as the Beloved [ἀγαπητός = Christ] of my Lord liveth, as the Spirit . . . liveth." Again in 8: 18 he says: "All [the angels] invoked the first, the Father, and his Beloved the Christ, and the Holy Spirit, all with united voice." In 9: 32—36, the Lord of glory [Christ] and the Holy Spirit are represented as objects of angelic worship; and in 11: 32, 33, they are represented as σύνθρονοι with the Father. There are other passages, also, of a similar tenor. But after all, in 9: 40 occurs a passage, which seems to render doubtful the force of Laurence's argument. It runs thus: "Then I saw that my Lord worshipped, and the angel of the Holy Spirit, and they both of them together glorified God [the Father]." This seems to develope at least the *subordination-theory* of the Trinity, and probably, along with this, something of the *emanation-system* of the Gnostics. The book is confessedly Gnostic, in some of its views respecting the spiritual world; and the doctrine of the Trinity, as here exhibited, would not be much unlike that of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and many others. I cannot doubt that the germ of the *emanation-theory* sprung up in middle Asia, where the celebrated system of Zoroaster would give immediate countenance to such speculations. A belief in one *underived* Being, and two *derived* Ones, who have all the attributes of divinity except self-existence and independence, was easily and obviously deducible from *Parsism*, and seems to have tinctured the views of our author. At all events, his doctrine of a Trinity is quite different from that in which Athanasius believed, and from that which Dr. Laurence would admit.

Nor is this the only mark of our author's *eastern* origin. There is one circumstance, lightly passed over even by Nitzsch as well as by the other critics, which would seem to indicate, somewhat plainly, the quarter from which some of his speculations had been borrowed. In 7: 22 the angel tells Isaiah, that 'his clothing is laid up . . . above all heavens,'

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *General Remarks.*

WHATEVER difference of opinion may exist among interpreters of the Apocalypse, in respect to the meaning which must be assigned to particular portions of it, there can be but one opinion, as it would seem, among intelligent and considerate readers, as to the *general* object or design of this book. It lies upon the very face of the whole composition, I mean the prophetic part of it, that *the coming and completion of the kingdom of God or of Christ*, or in other words, *the triumph of Christianity over all enemies and opposers, its universal prevalence in the world for a long series of years, and its termination in an endless period of glory and happiness*, constitute the main theme of the writer, and is indeed the almost exclusive subject of his contemplation.

The light, however, in which he has placed his subject, in order that it may be viewed by others, must be carefully examined and considered by the reader. The announcement of the triumphs which await the Christian church, is not made, as it might have been had the writer so pleased, by a simple categorical declaration. Christianity is in a manner personified, and it appears on the scene of action, engaged in a contest with the powers of darkness so violent, that the struggle must evidently end in the extermination or utter subjugation of one of the parties. Successively one and another bitter and bloody enemy of the church is overcome; then follows a long period of peace and prosperity, during which the influence of Christianity is so widely diffused, that no apparent hostility disturbs it. After this the powers of darkness renew their assault with exasperated malice and rage; but the interposing hand of heaven smites them down, and puts a final end to the contest. The peaceful and universal reign of the Christian religion then succeeds, and continues down to the final consummation of the Messianic kingdom on earth, when the resurrection and the judgment-day introduce a new and perfect order of things, which is to continue through ages that have no end.

Such is the simple and perspicuous outline of the Apocalypse. Like all, or nearly all, particular prophecies of the Old Testament and of the New, it has one, and but one, main object in view, to which all its various representations are subordinate, and to which also the particulars of each several part are more or less subservient.

Nothing could be more appropriate to the *time* and *circumstances* in which the book before us was composed, than the theme which the writer has chosen. Christians on all sides were agitated by bitter and bloody persecution. Many professed disciples of Christ were driven by fear, or allured by the hope of favor and worldly good, to renounce their allegiance to the Saviour; while others abstracted themselves from his service and shunned his followers, in order that they might avoid the horrors of persecution. The author of the Apocalypse possessed Christian sympathies of too high and holy a nature, to look on such a scene without deep emotion. To prevent an evil of so great magnitude, he was directed by the Saviour to write the book of Revelation, and to publish it by sending it to the seven churches of Asia.

The composition before us, then, seems to have been primarily occasioned by the existing state of things; and surely nothing could be more appropriate or better adapted to the purposes for which it was originally written. It is filled, from beginning to end, with encouragement and admonition and consolation to all who were engaged in the great contest then going on. Victory—victory—a final and universal and eternal victory of the church over all her enemies—is echoed at every pause; and a crown of glory is held forth by the God and Judge of all, as ready to be placed on the martyr's head, amid the joyful assembly of the first born in heaven, the moment he falls in the battle which he is waging. A most fearful end, moreover, awaits the enemies of the kingdom of God. The worshippers of the idolatrous beast, the adherents of the false prophet, yea, the beast himself and the prophet his coadjutor, with Satan and all the powers of darkness, are finally cast into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, where the smoke of their torment ascends up forever and ever, while they are suffering the agonies of the second death.

All that *hope* or *fear* can do, in the way of operating upon the minds of men, to encourage them to persevere in a holy course of life, and to dissuade them from opposition to God and the purposes of his redeeming grace, seems to be held forth by the Apocalypse. No book in all the Bible can, on the whole and when rightly understood, be regarded as exceeding it in respect to adaptedness for making impressions of such a salutary nature. If the human mind can be affected (and who will deny that it is most deeply affected?) by *hope* and *fear*, the highest point to which the agency of these principles can be carried, is attained by the writer of the Revelation.

Such powerful agencies, we may well say, were needed by Christians, when banishment and blood were the order of the day, in respect to the professed followers of a Saviour. Nor have such agencies ever, at any period since that time, ceased to be highly important; for, in every age, the church and the world have been in strenuous opposition, if not in actual contest. Even at the present hour, such a book as the Apocalypse is greatly needed, in order to encourage the faith and hope of Christians in regard to the prospects of the church, and to comfort them under their various sufferings and discouragements. Above all, the Apocalypse, when rightly understood, would be the *Vade Mecum* of such as go forth to publish a Saviour's name among the perishing heathen. Surrounded by those who are servants of the powers of darkness, discouraged perhaps by small success, and disheartened by the strength of superstitions, and by the zeal for bloody or foolish rites and ceremonies which pervades all around them, the faithful missionary may read with tears of joy the precious promises so often held out in the book before us — promises of the final and universal triumph of truth and love over all the opposition of error and of malignity; and when he lights upon the soul-reviving assurances of the Saviour that "he will surely come," his heart may respond, like that of the apocalyptic seer: "Amen; even so; Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

§ 2. *Comparison of the Apocalypse with other scriptural prophecies of a similar tenor.*

In many respects the light and shade of the picture which the Apocalypse presents, are peculiar to this book. No other part of Scripture, where the same general theme is the subject of contemplation, minutely resembles the Revelation as to *form* and *method*. Nowhere is the subject of the church's triumphs pursued to such a length, and exhibited with such continuity and fulness. Yet the same general theme, viz., the final and universal triumph of truth and holiness over error and sin, is by no means new or peculiar to the Apocalypse. Many other prophecies relate to this subject, and predict the same issue of the struggle between the powers of light and darkness.

To these prophecies, however, belong, as has just been hinted, some striking features of *diversity*, when compared with the Apocalypse, which deserve particular consideration. Most of them are quite brief, presenting only in a few verses that which is expanded by the author of the Apocalypse into almost an entire book. Most of them, moreover, present the simple fact of triumph over all the enemies of the church, without bringing into view any definite *series* or *succession* of triumphs. In short, they stand related to the Apocalypse, much as the simple story, or

historic facts, that form the basis of an epic poem, stand related to the poem itself, with all its machinery and with all the decorations that have sprung from the glowing imagination of the poet. The *kernel* or *nucleus* of the Apocalypse lies, indeed, enfolded in many a passage of the Old Testament, and in not a few of the New; but nowhere among all these passages is any such full and ample development of the subject made, as in the writing before us. Never before had such a full development been so much needed. The time was now come, during the apostolic age, when the kingdom of God was to be built up on its new and last foundation, and when the fulfilment of all that the ancient Scriptures contain respecting it, was about to commence. The writer of the Apocalypse lived in the very midst of the contest that was going on, was himself a sufferer in it, and therefore took a deep interest in the theme which was the main object of his book. Vivid feeling and powerful representation might be expected of him in circumstances like these; and such the Apocalypse everywhere exhibits.

The charge has indeed not unfrequently been made against this book, that it is altogether *unique*, and that the genius of the whole New Testament stands in opposition to it, or at least is as widely distant from it as possible. Even Luther, as we know, treated the Revelation with neglect, at first, if not with scorn, because, as he averred, he could not find Christ in it; for, as he viewed the subject, Jesus Christ, and Christ as *crucified*, must be the main theme of all that belongs to a true gospel-book. This is not the place to examine the allegations of Luther; but thus much may be said, without fear of contradiction by any intelligent reader of the present day, namely, that of all the books in the New Testament, *Christ*, as the beginning, middle, and end, appears most conspicuous in the Apocalypse. The peculiarity of manner in this book, i. e. the peculiarity of style, diction, plan, and mode of representation—in a word, of all which belongs simply to *costume*—I readily concede; indeed, I have already alluded to it in the preceding remarks. But we shall see in the sequel, that the *fundamental truth* or *basis* of the Apocalypse is one which is a common theme of prophecy, both in the Old Testament and in the New. In order to confirm this, we must pass in brief review some of the evidence which lies before us.

I. Passages in the Old Testament.

(1) Gen. 3: 15. From the early origin of our race, immediately after the fall of man, the prediction was uttered by his merciful Judge, that 'the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head.' I am aware that some have rejected the idea of finding a predicted Messiah here. But it seems to be plain, that the apostle, who (Rom. 16: 20) prays that 'the God of peace, would shortly *bruise Satan under the feet* of the

Romish Christians,' understood the declaration in Gen. 3: 15 as a prediction of the triumph of the church over the powers of darkness. And in Rev. 12: 17, the dragon is represented as 'going to make war with the seed of the woman,' with evident allusion to the declaration of the same text. With such examples before us, why should we hesitate to avow our persuasion, that the promise in Gen. 3: 15 pertains to the Saviour and the church, and that it announces the same sentiment which lies at the basis of the Apocalypse, namely that truth and love shall at last come off victorious over falsehood and malignity.

(2) In Gen. 12: 3. 18: 18. 22: 18, are promises to Abraham, that "in him, or in his seed, all the nations of the earth should be blessed." In Gen. 17: 5 is a promise, that 'he should become the father of many nations.' In Gen. 26: 4, the promise made to Abraham is renewed to Isaac, who is told, that 'in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed.' If now we may allow Paul to be our expositor here, we shall find that in Rom. iv. and in Gal. iii, he interprets the promises made to Abraham as having reference to the *Messiah*, to the calling of the Gentiles, and to the wide diffusion of the gospel among them. That Abraham himself so understood them, seems to be highly probable from what the Saviour says, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad," John 8: 56. Still we find nothing more explicitly predicted here, than that some one of Abraham's posterity should arise, who would be a blessing not only to the patriarch's seed, but to the Gentile world at large. When, how, or by what means all this was to be accomplished, these early predictions do not of themselves inform us. That Abraham, in consequence of them, looked forward to a *Messianic* day, when the triumphs of truth and love over the powers of darkness and malignity should take place, we know. But how *definite* his knowledge or expectation was, we have no sure means of determining. Be this as it may, the germ of the Apocalypse lies in the promises made to Abraham and his seed.

(3) The prophetic declaration of the dying Jacob, in respect to Judah, was, that "the scepter should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh should come; and to him should the gathering of the people be;" Gen. 49 : 10.

It would be foreign to my purpose to enter into the critical disputes about this passage. It is enough, that by general accord it is now acknowledged, that שִׁילֹה (from שָׁלָה) may mean either *peace-maker*, or *tranquilitas*. Even in the latter case, as Gesenius (Lex. s. v.) concedes, the expectation of *quiet* is in and through the *king Messiah*, who is to spring from Judah. *Peace-maker*, or *Prince-of-peace*, is a name highly appropriate to the future king of the Jews, (comp. Is. 9 : 6); and to those who believe that God made promises of a Messianic nature to

Abraham and to Isaac, it will not seem strange that they were also renewed to the dying Jacob. But there is still the same simple and *generic* idea at the basis of this promise, which forms the basis of the preceding ones, viz., that some one among the progeny of Judah should be a blessing to the world at large: "Unto him shall the gathering of the people (עַמִּים *nations*) be." With this we may compare Is. 42: 4, where it is said respecting the *Elect Servant* of God, that "he shall not fail . . . until he have set judgment in the earth, and made the isles to wait for his law." Haggai 2: 7 gives a like sense: "I will shake all nations, and the *Desire* of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with my glory;" and many more passages might easily be quoted, of the same tenor. The passage in Haggai shows what the disposition of the nations shall be in respect to the Messiah; for he is named their DESIRE. The passage in Isaiah shows the *extent* to which the nations will be "gathered."

(4) Passing by the *historical* books, in which some Messianic predictions may be found, e. g. 2 Sam. 7: 12 seq., let us proceed to the book of Psalms. The second Psalm, with nearly all of the ancient interpreters and most of the modern ones, we may regard as *Messianic*. We have a special reason for so doing, inasmuch as Paul, in Acts 13: 33 and Heb. 1: 5, has expressly and plainly quoted it as being Messianic. In this Psalm we are presented, first, with the combination of the wicked against the person and dominion of their anointed King; then with the determination of him who "sitteth in the heavens" that 'the throne of this King should be established, and that all nations, even the uttermost parts of the earth, should be given to him as a heritage. All who continue to oppose his righteous dominion, will be dashed in pieces as a potter's vessel.' Such then is to be the dominion and power of the Anointed King; his sway is to be universal, his power to "put all enemies under his feet" is irresistible. And such—to all intents and purposes—is the picture presented of this King in the Apocalypse. He goes forth "conquering and to conquer." He is "King of kings and Lord of lords;" and all who oppose themselves to his righteous and lawful dominion are "dashed in pieces as a potter's vessel."

But how different the *mode* of David and John, in presenting the same great truth! In Ps. ii, a few verses, couched in simple figurative language, are employed to designate all which the writer intended to say; probably all that was present to his mind. But in the Apocalypse, we have a protracted series of events, all represented to us by *symbols* throughout. Yet if all which is here symbolized should be combined together into one brief and general view, it could not be more simply and happily presented, than it is in the second Psalm.

The reader will easily be able to make for himself, without any sug-

gestions from me, the like remarks on a large number of the Messianic passages yet to be produced. I shall therefore deem it unnecessary for me to repeat them.

(5) To Ps. viii. a *Messianic* sense is denied by many interpreters of the present day. It would be out of place for me here to enter into a critical vindication of the interpretation which I feel constrained to give it, when I construe it as being Messianic. In so doing, I follow the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (2: 6—9), who clearly makes such an application of its sentiments. In this Psalm, again, the simple *generic* idea of universal dominion stands prominent; connected, as a matter of course, with the supreme exaltation and glory of the personage thus exalted. In all respects the *matter* is substantially the same as that in Ps. ii, while the *costume* is quite different, and the comminatory part of Ps. ii. is here omitted.

(6) Ps. xxii. is another portion of Scripture, the Messianic sense of which I cannot hesitate to acknowledge. I would not appeal to the commencing words of it, as repeated by the dying Saviour upon the cross, for satisfactory proof of this; because he might have quoted a pious sentiment from a Psalm not Messianic: but I may appeal to Matt. 27: 39, 43 and to John 19: 24, for satisfactory proof that the Evangelists regarded this Psalm as Messianic. Somewhat more than half of the Psalm is occupied with describing the *sufferings* of the Messiah. Verse 22 begins the note of joy and triumph. He who had been a degraded sufferer, is to praise God in the midst of the congregation for deliverance; and this deliverance is to be proclaimed before the world as a ground of trust and confidence in God. "All the ends of the world, too, will call it to mind and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations will worship before him." . . "The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is to govern among the nations." . . "A people that is to be born shall declare his righteousness." Here again, the simple idea is, that he who once was in a suffering and dying condition, shall become the instrument of bringing all nations to serve and to praise the Lord; which latter idea is the same that is contained in Ps. ii. and viii, although it is invested with a drapery quite different.

(7) Ps. xlv. One greater than David or Solomon appears to be here. *Unto the Son* a part, at least, of the words of this Psalm are said by a sacred writer to be addressed, Heb. 1: 8; and well may we credit this, when the nature of the Psalm is thoroughly examined. The writer presents us with a view of a king, fair, eloquent, heroic, a wise and condescending and upright governor, and an irresistible conqueror of all his enemies. His dominion is eternal; and that all people may yield a willing subjection to him, he becomes affianced to the daughter of a foreign prince, and admits other foreign princesses among the retinue of

his court. Cheerful subjection to him is yielded, in prospect of the blessings to be enjoyed. Here again is presented the same attitude of things as in the Apocalypse. "The arrows are sharp in the hearts of the king's enemies," and "the people fall beneath his terrible right arm." The image of the bride, the Lamb's wife (Rev. 19: 7—9), seems to have been suggested to the apocalyptic seer, by the royal espousals described in the Psalm before us. Even the special idea at the close of the Ps. (v. 16), viz. that the children of the bride are to be "made princes in all the earth," is repeatedly brought before us in the Apocalypse, by the declaration that Christians are to be made "kings and priests unto God;" see Rev. 1: 6. 5: 10. 20: 6, comp. 1 Pet. 2: 9.

(8) I cannot prove that Ps. lxxii. is Messianic; but I may suggest, that the contents seem to be appropriately applied when they are so interpreted, and that what is said here is of higher import than belongs to any ordinary king. Although it is not directly quoted and applied to the Messiah in the New Testament, yet, with Rosenmueller, I must think that a greater than David, Solomon, or any Jewish king, is to be found here. The dominion of the Prince here described is to extend "from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." He will be a merciful, just, and powerful king, vindicating the oppressed and helping the poor and needy. In his days shall the earth yield a most abundant increase; its "fruit shall wave like Lebanon;" and all nations shall pour into his treasures their precious substance. "His name shall endure as long as the sun . . . all nations shall call him blessed." Here again is the usual idea of universal dominion, with the accessory one of universal and extraordinary fruitfulness of the earth. For the first time we find this latter idea here introduced. *Literally* I do not suppose it is to be interpreted, any more than other similar images in descriptions of this nature. But the least which can be said, is, that it is a lively image of prosperity and happiness under the reign which is here predicted.

(9) Ps. cx. very much resembles the second Psalm in the tenor of its contents, and has been very generally conceded to be Messianic. Matt. 22: 42—45. Acts 2: 34—26. 1 Cor. 15: 25, and Heb. 1: 13. 5: 6, seem to leave no room for doubt, that the New Testament writers at any rate regarded this Psalm as Messianic. Supreme exaltation and dominion are here ascribed to a King, who is to be enthroned with God. His enemies are all to be subdued and prostrated, by a contest which shall fill many places with dead bodies, and wound the heads over many countries. A King and a Priest forever the conqueror is then to be made, by the immutable oath of God. The *priesthood* which is here ascribed to this exalted king, seems to be the only point of difference between this and Psalm ii. which needs to be mentioned. In other respects, there is simply the idea of universal sway and of irresistible permanent power

and dominion presented to our view. That this glorious King is also to be a *Priest forever*, is an accessory idea by no means to be overlooked. The Apocalypse also presents us with a view of the Messiah, as having made his followers "kings and priests to God forever and ever," by the offering of his own blood in the capacity of our great high Priest.

(10) Passing by minor and controverted passages, let us next take a view of what the *Evangelical Prophet* has said, in relation to the subject before us. Is. 2: 2—4, (with which Mic. 4: 1—4 should be compared), presents us with the simple idea, that the Lord's house shall be exalted high above all other places of worship, and that all nations shall go up to pay their homage there, and to learn the laws and statutes of Jehovah. When this shall come to pass, universal peace shall prevail, and the nations learn war no more. This unites the two leading ideas in Gen. 49: 10 and Ps. ii. *Shiloh* or *Peace-maker* is to come in the last days, and the uttermost parts of the earth are to be given to him as a heritage. The Messianic nature of this passage is admitted almost without a question.

(11) Equally plain is the passage in Is. 9: 1—7. 'Great light is to be scattered over the nations who have been walking in darkness. The rod of every oppressor is to be broken, the noise of battle to cease, garments rolled in blood no more to be seen; while the Prince of peace, whose name is Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the perpetual Father or Guardian of his people, is to have a government of which there shall be no end, and his throne to be established in judgment and justice forever and ever.' The tenor of this is the same with that of Is. 2: 2—4, although the manner of the annunciation is quite diverse. The leading idea in both these passages should be compared with those views in the Apocalypse, which present the universality of Christ's kingdom, the peaceable reign, first of a thousand years, and then again of a period after the enemies of the church, the hosts of Gog and Magog, are destroyed.

(12) In Is. 11: 1—10, "the Shoot from the stem of Jesse, the Branch from his roots," is to be endowed with every gift and grace which will qualify him to judge with equity and to rule with wisdom and discretion. A time of universal peace shall succeed, in which all, even the noxious beasts and reptiles of the earth, are to lay aside their enmity, and live in harmony with each other. "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." To the "ensign" of the people "shall the Gentiles seek, and his dwelling-place shall be glorious." It is remarkable how frequently and with what ardour the prophet Isaiah dwells on this view of the Messianic reign. Its unlimited extent and its undisturbed peace fill him with holy ecstasy.

(13) Is. 35: 1—10 presents us with a somewhat different picture. All

the desolate and desert parts of the earth are to become fruitful. Zion is to be saved from all her enemies. The eyes of the blind are to be opened; the ears of the deaf are to be unstopped; the tongue of the dumb to sing; the lame man is to leap as a hart; and a highway to the house of God is to be made, over which no unclean person, and no ravenous beast, shall pass. "The redeemed shall walk there, . . . and come the ransomed of the Lord to Zion, with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads." The idea of an extraordinary fruitfulness of the earth is here presented in a manner like to that in Ps. lxxii. The freedom from suffering and sorrow and sin, which will prevail in the days of Zion's deliverance, is held up in a most cheering and vivid manner.

(14) With the controversy respecting the genuineness of Is. xl—lxvi, I have nothing to do at present. My belief is, that, to say the least, no proof that ought to satisfy us has yet been adduced, to show that these chapters belong to a prophet who lived near the close of the Babylonish exile. At all events, nothing can be more certain, than that the writers of the New Testament appeal to these chapters as a genuine portion of the Scriptures; and equally plain it appears to be, that they appeal to them as the production of Isaiah. Is. 42: 1—9 seems plainly to be Messianic, and is so applied in Matt. 12: 17—21. The prediction is, that the elect servant of God shall, by his gentle and inoffensive demeanor, bring forth judgment unto victory, proclaim it to the Gentiles, and make the isles to wait for his law. He shall be "for a covenant to the people, for a light to the Gentiles," and bring out the prisoners who are confined in the darkness of dungeons. The Maker of heaven and earth declares this, and will perform it. The universality of the influence of the Prince of peace is plainly exhibited by this figurative representation.

(15) Is. 49: 1—12 presents us with nearly the same picture, although drawn with somewhat different colours. The Servant of the Lord, although frustrated at first in his attempts to persuade Israel, will yet bring back the remnant of them, and become a light to the Gentiles, even unto the ends of the earth. He will be for "a covenant of the people," and all nations, with their kings and princes, shall bow down before him. In vs. 18—26 of the same chapter, a picture is presented of the prosperity and enlargement of Zion. Her lost children are to be restored; the Gentiles are to bring them in, and kings are to become nursing-fathers, and queens nursing-mothers, and all her enemies are to be humbled.

(16) Is. 52: 7—15 presents another description of a like tenor. Good tidings to Zion are published; her God reigns; the ends of the earth are to see the salvation of God; the Servant of the Lord will make many nations to leap for joy, and kings will do him reverence.

(17) Is. 54: 1—5 represents Jerusalem as enlarging itself and break-

ing forth on the right hand and on the left; as inheriting the Gentiles; as having her Maker for her husband, and the Holy One of Israel for her Redeemer, who shall be called "the God of the whole earth."

(18) Is. 55: 1—5 invites all without distinction to come and buy wine and milk without money and without price; an everlasting covenant is to be made with them, and the sure mercies of David to be given them. The offspring of David is to be given as a leader and commander of the people, and Zion is to call a nation whom she knew not, and nations that knew not her are to run unto her.

(19) Is. 60: 1—22 exhibits a variegated and most beautiful picture of the future prosperity and glory of the church. The Gentiles shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising. All nations will flock to her, and bring their freewill-offerings in abundance. Any who refuse, shall be utterly laid waste. Universal peace and prosperity will attend her; wasting and destruction shall no more invade her; her light shall never be withdrawn; mourning no more take place; her people shall be all righteous; and her increase like that when *one* becomes a *thousand*. The Lord will surely accomplish all this, in his time.

(20) Is. 65: 17—25. A new heavens and a new earth are to be created. Jerusalem is to become a rejoicing, and her people a joy. Infirmities, sorrows, and brevity of life, shall no more be experienced. Long life, great prosperity, and undisturbed peace, shall be enjoyed. All enmity, even among the beasts of the field, shall cease, and there shall be nothing to hurt or offend in all the holy mountain of God. Vs. 19—24 represent Israel as gathered from among all the nations of the earth and brought to Jerusalem. There shall pure worship be established, so long as the new heavens and the new earth remain before the Lord, and all flesh shall go up to worship there, from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another.

The attentive reader must have already observed, in respect to these predictions of "the evangelical prophet," that *nearly all of them look beyond the redemption of the Jews, and include the Gentiles along with them.* It is a circumstance worthy of note on a *critical* account, inasmuch as it serves to show, that the same *tenor* of Messianic prophecy is exhibited in the former part of the book of Isaiah, as is developed in the latter part. All is expansive, catholic in the highest sense, truly *evangelical*, and demonstrative of a benevolence commensurate with the wants and woes of a perishing world. That the simple theme which lies at the basis of all these predictions, is the future and universal prevalence of true piety and religion, is evident from the first perusal of them. How exactly this accords with the main design of the Apocalypse, needs not to be again asserted.

The general tenor of *succeeding* prophecies in the Old Testament, is

more *Hebraistic* or *Jewish* in its character. Foreign nations are less the objects of the writers' thoughts. To the wants and woes of the Jewish nation, when they came into a state of exile and oppression, the prophets of a later period more immediately address themselves. The Jews, they predict, will be again brought back to their country, and restored to the divine favour. The time is coming when they shall all turn to God, with repentance for their past transgressions, and with full purpose of new and evangelical obedience.

Much less frequent, also, are the Messianic prophecies in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets who lived during the period of the exile, than they are in the book of Isaiah. The sins and sorrows of the Jewish nation seem to occupy almost the whole soul of the sympathizing, consoling, warning seers, during that season of chastisement and distress.

(21) Jer. 23: 5—8. After the Jews have gathered in from their dispersion, the righteous Branch of David shall reign over them and prosper. He shall be called *the Lord our Righteousness;* and in his days shall Judah and Jerusalem be safe.

(22) Jer. 31: 27—37. The house of Israel and Judah shall be built up, and they shall cease to bear the iniquity of their fathers. A new covenant shall be made with them, different from the ancient one. God's law shall be written upon their hearts; and all shall know him from the least to the greatest. The Lord will be their God; he will forgive all their sins, and cast them off no more. This decree is perpetual as the ordinances of the sun and of the moon. Comp. Heb. 8: 10 seq.

(23) Jer. 33: 13—26. Judea shall again be inhabited; the Branch of Righteousness, which is of David, shall thrive, and execute judgment and justice in the land. Judah and Jerusalem shall be safe under his protection; his throne shall be perpetual. Pure offerings and holy priests shall never be wanting. The seed of David and the priests shall be multiplied as the stars of heaven. The covenant by which all this is secured, is sure and lasting as that of day and night.

These are all the conspicuous prophecies in the book of Jeremiah, that have a relation to the subject in question. The mere inspection of these shows us, that they are confined to the part which the Jewish nation will act, during the future period of the church's prosperity and splendour.

(24) Of the same tenor are all the prophecies in Ezekiel, with regard to this subject. Ezek. 34: 23—31. One Shepherd shall be set over Israel, viz. David the servant of God. He shall be their Prince. They shall enjoy peace and safety. The earth shall yield abundant increase. Neither the heathen nor beasts of prey shall any more annoy them. The Plant of renown among them shall supply their wants, and the Lord shall be their God.

(25) Ezek. 36: 24—38. From all countries shall the Jews be gathered; they shall be purified, and a new heart given to them. God will give them his Spirit, and cause them to obey his laws. He will save them from their enemies, and from all the various evils which they had so long suffered. They shall become true penitents, and their land, which was a desolation, shall be like the garden of Eden. God will be inquired of, in order that he may do all this for them; and all the waste places of Judea shall be restored.

(26) Ezek. 37: 21—28. The Jews shall all be gathered in, and become one nation, and one King shall reign over them. They shall no more return to the worship of idols. David shall be king over them, and be their prince forever. They shall dwell in their own land, and God will make an everlasting covenant with them, and be their God, and they shall be his people.

(27) Ezek. 39: 20—28. The prediction in this passage refers evidently to a more distant and subsequent period of the prosperity of the church, i. e. a period which follows the great irruption made upon it by Gog and Magog, whose forces are destroyed by divine interposition; comp. Rev. 20: 7—10. The amount of the prediction is, as before, that the Jews should be gathered from all countries, become penitent, and obtain mercy. God will pour out his Spirit abundantly upon them, and he will never more hide his face from them.

Thus we perceive, that all the predictions in Ezekiel are of the same tenor with those in Jeremiah, and have respect merely to the future lot of the Jewish nation.

(28) The book of Daniel expands again into somewhat of the like tenor with that of Isaiah, only it is more brief and more general. Dan. 2: 44. The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, (after the days of the four kingdoms symbolized by the image seen in Nebuchadnezzar's dream,) which shall break in pieces and destroy all other kingdoms, and stand forever.

(29) Dan. 7: 13, 14, 27. To the *Son of Man* is given a kingdom, and dominion, and glory. All nations will serve him; and his dominion is everlasting. The kingdom *under the whole heaven* is given to the people of the saints of the most high God.

(30) Dan. 9: 24—27. This contains the famous passage respecting the *seventy weeks*. But as no interpretation of this has yet been given, so far as I know, which meets all the demands of critical exegesis, or entirely satisfies the minds of candid and enlightened inquirers, I will not count upon this passage, on the present occasion.

(31) Dan. 12: 1—3. Great trouble, such as never before existed among the Jewish nation, shall come upon them; but the people of God shall be delivered. Many that sleep in the dust shall arise. They that

be wise, and turn many to righteousness, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever.*

In the book of Daniel, then, the two predictions, which are sufficiently plain to be here counted upon, are of the same tenor with those in Isaiah, and in the Apocalypse. Different are the representations of the minor prophets in general.

(32) Hos. 3: 4, 5. The children of Israel shall be many days without a prince, without sacrifices and ritual ceremonies, and afterwards shall return and seek the Lord, and David their king, and fear the Lord in the latter days.

(33) Joel 2: 28—32. God will pour out his Spirit on all flesh, even all the different classes of men from the highest to the lowest, and will exhibit astonishing signs of his presence and power. All that call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

(34) Joel 3: 17—21. No strangers shall annoy or pollute God's holy mountain. The land shall flow with milk and wine; while the countries of all its enemies shall be laid waste. Jerusalem and Judah shall have a permanent residence, and be made clean. This prediction seems to compare well with Ezek. 39: 20—28, which relates to the times that are subsequent to the invasion of Gog and Magog. It characterizes the *old age* of the world, and therefore can be compared only with the season which follows the time of Gog and Magog, as mentioned in Rev. 20: 8—10.

(35) Amos 9: 11—15. The tabernacle of David, which has fallen, is to be raised up, and the breaches thereof repaired. A season of peace and great plenty is to follow. The people of God are to be planted in their own land, and to be no more disturbed.

(36) Hag. 2: 6, 7. Heaven and earth, the sea and the dry land, are to be shaken. The Desire of all nations is to come, and fill the house of the Lord with glory.

(37) Zech. 12: 10—14. Universal penitence and mourning is to take place among the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. They are to mourn over Him whom they have pierced.

(38) Zech. 14: 20, 21. Holiness to the Lord is to be inscribed on

* I hesitate whether this is to be put to the account of Messianic prophecies. The certain object of it does not, as yet, seem to have been clearly and in all respects satisfactorily made out. The *resurrection* here mentioned some have thought to agree with that brought to view as preceding the Millennium, in Rev. 20: 4—6. But in the latter case, only Christians, or perhaps only Christian martyrs, appear to be the subjects of the first resurrection; while in Dan. 12: 2, we find some to be raised to *everlasting life*, and some to *everlasting contempt;* i. e. a *general* resurrection seems to be indicated here, while that in Rev. 20: 4—6 is, to say the most, only *partial*. More light is needed in respect to both passages, in order to obtain full and entire satisfaction.

everything which belongs to his house and to Jerusalem. The Canaanites will no more dwell in the land. This prophecy seems to tally with that in Ezek. 39: 20—28. Joel 3: 17—21. Rev. 20: 8—10, and to relate to the times which are to follow the invasion by Gog and Magog.

(39) Mal. 4: 2—6. The Sun of righteousness will arise with healing in his wings. Israel shall prosper, and the wicked be trodden down. Elijah, the prophet, will come as the forerunner of the day of the Lord. He will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers.

Such is the tenor of the predictions in the Old Testament, in relation to the deeply interesting subject before us. I have not aimed at citing them all; and I have purposely omitted such as relate merely to the *person* of the Messiah; because these had been fulfilled when the Apocalypse was written, and could not be there introduced as *predictions* of what was yet to come. Only such prophecies as have relation to the universal spread of religion, whether among the Jews, or Gentiles, or both, have a direct bearing on our subject. Of these the number is so great, as to leave no room for well-grounded doubt in the mind, that the pious Jews of former ages must have been filled with high expectations in regard to the Messianic period, and, like good old Simeon, must have been waiting for the *Consolation of Israel*, or, like Abraham, they must have seen the Saviour's day afar off, and have been glad.

That some of the predictions cited above, as having relation to the future extent and glory of the church, have been, and will be, interpreted differently from what they are here supposed to mean, every reader well versed in biblical interpretation will know without admonition. It is a fact, moreover, that interpreters have not been wanting, who have even denied that there is any such thing as *real* prediction, either in the Old Testament or in the New; and many such are now upon the stage. But as my present concern is not with the dispute between Rationalists and Believers in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, so I cannot here enter into it, nor stop to vindicate my exegesis. It is enough for my present purpose to say, that I have made such an application of the prophecies cited, as I believe to be well founded. At all events, the same principles will apply to them as to the Apocalypse; and if the one is *prophetic*, the other also is so. The basis of both is evidently the same, viz. the universal spread and triumph of true religion. The only seeming exceptions here, are those prophecies which have respect only to the future conversion and restoration of the *whole* Jewish people. But I cannot regard what is said in this respect, as standing at all in opposition to such predictions as the book of Isaiah contains. The

prophets who have spoken only of the restoration of the Jews, had their reasons, doubtless, for so doing—reasons, one would think, connected with the circumstances, the time, the place, the relations, in which they uttered their respective predictions. It would not be safe to conclude, that because only a reformation in part is expressly predicted in a particular passage, a universal one is intended to be denied. We can only conclude from such a phenomenon, that for some good reason the prophets, who uttered the partial predictions, proceeded at that time no further.

On the whole, then, nothing can be plainer, in view of what has already been laid before the reader, than that *the main subject of the Apocalypse is not in the least degree a novel one.* The costume; the length and connection of the several series of predictions; the symbols unceasingly employed; the nature of these symbols in some respects; the connection which all hopes of the future reformation and salvation of a perishing world have with the religion instituted by the Saviour of men; and the peculiar development of the kingdom of God in consequence of this;—all these are in the main *new* circumstances, it must be confessed, and peculiar to the author of the Apocalypse. But these are matters which are immediately connected with the style and peculiar situation of the writer, and with the times in which he lived, and are not substantially concerned with the main and fundamental design of his whole composition. In *substance*, there is an entire unity between the Old Testament prophecies and the Apocalypse, as to the future extent and completion of the kingdom of God, or the reign of true piety and virtue. A pious and intelligent Jew, or any sober person familiar with the writings of the Old Testament, could not overlook the identity of the main object in both the cases that have just been named.

II. Passages in the New Testament.

But have the *New Testament writers* exhibited anything of the same expectations? Has the Saviour himself given any intimation that he was sent to *others*, as well as "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel?" The answer is not difficult; for it is plain that one heart and soul, in relation to the subject before us, pervade the writers of the New Testament and of the Old.

(40) Matt. 8: 11. When Jesus had healed the servant of a Roman centurion, he is reported by the Evangelist to have marvelled at the faith of this heathen man, and to have said: "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God." In Luke 13: 29, the Evangelist adds: "From the north and the south," as well as from the east and the west.

i. e. in the seventh or uppermost heaven. Again, in 8: 14 the same angel tells him, that 'after the death of his body, he shall ascend to the seventh heaven, and there assume his clothing, and there see other clothings which are *laid up* and numbered.' The same sentiment is repeated in chap. 9: 2, 18, 24, and 11: 40. In his General Remarks, p. 167 seq., Dr. Laurence traces this peculiarity to the Zohar, the most ancient, as well as the most ample collection of Cabbalistical remains; and the passages which he adduces exhibit a similarity of conception in regard to the heavenly clothing of the saints. But I apprehend the origin of this idea, in both productions, may be easily traced to a more ancient and very direct source. In the Zend Avesta, which seems to have been written more than five centuries before the Christian era, among the second order of angels (Izeds) are reckoned the *Gahs*, to whom many supplications are directed (see Kleuker's Zend Avesta, Izeshne, Ha LII.); and one part of the office of the female Gahs is, to *prepare clothing* and lay it up in Gorotman [heaven] for such as are the faithful servants of Ormusd. With this the souls of the righteous will be clothed, after the resurrection; see Kleuker's Zend. Av. I. p. 142; also Anhang. I. Th. I. p. 283. The costume of the Ascension and of the Zohar, in regard to this matter, seems to be kindred with that of *Parsism*; and this is well known to have influenced the speculations of the Kabbalists and the Gnostics.

Another remarkable coincidence with the costume of the Apocalypse deserves special mention. In Ascens. vii. 9 is a passage which represents the prophet Isaiah, in his rapture, as passing the רָקִיעַ or firmament, i. e. the upper region of the atmosphere or the apparent vicinity of the sun and stars, and as there beholding Samael [Satan] and his angels in fierce contention, and doing deeds of desperation. Who can refrain from calling to mind Rev. 12: 7—9, where Michael and his angels are represented as contending *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, i. e. in the first heaven or upper air, against Satan and his angels? Or who can refrain from calling to mind Paul's "prince of the power of the air [prince of aerial dominion], who worketh in the children of disobedience" (Eph. 2: 2), or "the principalities, and powers, and rulers of the darkness of this world [of this benighted world], . . . spiritual wickedness in high places," i. e. wicked spirits in elevated, q. d. aerial places, Eph. 6: 12? That evil spirits lived in the *atmospheric* region, was plainly a popular belief of the first century, (see Exc. I. Vol. II.); and thence Berial and his powers are to be "dragged down to hell," when the Lord shall come, according to Ascens. 4: 14. Does not this serve to cast light on those passages of the New Testament quoted above, and on others of the like tenor?

I cannot suppress the remark, that chap. xi. of the Ascension appears manifestly to be copied from the account of the nativity of the Saviour in

Matt. 1: 18—25, and shows, if it be genuine, that in the first century this was a part of the Gospels. I know of no good reason to doubt its genuineness. The writer has, indeed, presented a wonderful *birth*, as well as conception; but this belongs to the manner of the book, and constitutes one of its *apocryphal* traits.

On the whole, it is impossible to read this production with attention, without feeling that one's circle of acquaintance with oriental imagery is enlarged thereby, and also with the opinions and speculations of curious minds in the first age of Christianity. He is not to be envied as a critic, who can peruse such a book without the most lively interest.

[The reader who wishes further and more particular information, is referred to the Ascensio Isaiae Vatis, a Ricardo Laurence, LL. D. Oxon. 1819; Gesenius Einleit. in Esaiam, § 9, p. 45 seq.; Lücke, Einleit. in Apoc. § 16, p. 125 seq. and I. Nitzsch on two Fragments of the *Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐου*, in the Studien und Kritiken, III. p. 209 seq. The *fragments* were discovered by A. Maio, in the Vatican library, and published in 1828 in his Nova Collectio Scriptt. Vet., Pars II. p. 208. Nitzsch has exhibited these, and made, at the close of his communication, some highly acute and critical remarks on the whole production. A Latin translation of the *Vision* or second part of the work, was mentioned by Sixtus Senensis in his Biblioth. Sancta, Lib. II. p. 59, as printed at Venice under the title of *Visio Admirabilis Esaiae Prophetae;* which, after disappearing for a long time, has at last been discovered in the library at München and at Copenhagen. In this version, chap. xi. 2—21 of the Ethiopic version is wanting. The quotations of this book by the fathers, may be found in Laurence's General Remarks; and a brief account of them, both in Gesenius and Lücke.]

(b) The Book of Enoch.

Several circumstances conspire to throw more than ordinary interest around this apocryphal production. From ancient times, it has been believed that Jude has made a quotation from it, in vs. 14, 15 of his brief epistle. Some of the earliest fathers, moreover, have appealed to it even in such a way, as to show that they regarded it as entitled to a rank scarcely, if at all, inferior to that of an acknowledged canonical book.

In the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, one of the most respectable of the apocryphal productions, and one which, beyond all reasonable doubt, belongs to the latter part of the first century or to the beginning of the second,* the book of Enoch is the subject of express appeal and of citation no less than nine times, besides some other probable allusions to it. The *mode* of appeal shows the weight of authority attached, by the writer of the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, to the book now under examination. In Test. Sim. c. 5, he says: *Ἑώρακα ἐν χαρακτῆρι γραφῆς Ἐνώχ, ὅτι, κ. τ. λ.*; in Test. Lev. c. 10, *καθὼς περιέχει βίβλος Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου*; and the like in c. 14. c. 16. Test. Dan. c. 5,

* So Nitzsch has satisfactorily shown, in his *De Testamentis* XII. *Patriarcharum*, Lib. Vet. Test. Pseudepigrapho, p. 17 seq.

Test. Jud. c. 18. Test. Zeb. c. 3. Nepht. c. 4. Benj. c. 9. In Test. Reub. c. 5, there is a plain reference to that part of the book of Enoch, which exhibits the seduction of women before the flood by some of the apostate angels, viz. Enoch, ch. vii. viii.

The manner and object of these appeals leaves no room to doubt, that the author of the Testaments regarded and cited the book of Enoch as one of canonical authority, or, to say the least, as one whose decision, or declaration, or prediction, was to be looked upon as credible and authoritative. And inasmuch as the author of the Testaments has thus quoted and alluded to the book of Enoch, near the close of the first century or at the beginning of the second, it follows of course that the latter must have already been in circulation, and obtained credit among the expected readers of the Testaments; consequently we are bound, at all events, to assign a period as early as the *first* century to the composition of the book of Enoch.

So Justin Martyr (Apol. Brev. p. 92, edit. ex. Cong. Sanct. Mauri) exhibits a passage respecting the apostate angels, who seduced women before the flood and in various ways corrupted the world, which passage beyond all question is built on the book of Enoch, chap. vii—ix, although he does not specifically name the book. Irenaeus refers to the punishment of angels who thus sinned (Cont. Haeres. IV. 30, Massuet 16), and speaks of Enoch as "conservatus *usque nunc* testis judicii Dei," by which he must mean that the words of Enoch, as contained in his so named *prophecy*, are still preserved. Tertullian, in Lib. de Idol. c. 4 and 15, also in his De Cultu Fem. c. 10, appeals to Enoch, as "the ancient prophet Enoch," and cites some things which he declares the Holy Spirit to have announced by him. Again, in De Habitu Fem. c. 2. 3, he argues at length in favour of the divine inspiration and authority of the book; on grounds, indeed, which will not abide the test of scrutiny, but still he is evidently much in earnest, and accuses the Jews of having rejected the *authority* of this book, because it contained certain things in it *respecting Christ*. He also concedes, "scripturam Enoch . . . *non recipi* a quibusdam;" i. e. some Christians reject it, or do not admit it into the canon of the sacred books. He declares, however, that it is a profitable book for Christians; and that we have warrant enough for believing, that 'every writing adapted to edification is inspired of God,' [alluding to 2 Tim. 3: 16]. Finally, in order to settle the question of authority, he adds: "Accedit, quod Enoch apud *Judam Apostolum* testimonium possidet."

The book of Enoch (c. 97: 7, 8) is also cited by him in his De Idololat. c. 4, in almost exactly the same words that a literal Latin translation of the Ethiopic copy of this book would exhibit. The general identity of the book of Enoch, as used by Tertullian, with that which has

come down to us through the medium of the Ethiopic, seems therefore to be beyond any reasonable question.

Clement of Alexandria (c. A. D. 200), refers to the book of Enoch and quotes from it, (*Ἐκλογ. προφ.* pp. 801, 808, ed. Sylb. and in many other places); but he expresses no opinion as to its authority.

Origen frequently refers to the book of Enoch; e. g. Cont. Cels. p. 267, ed. Spencer; *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, IV. cap. ult. et I. c. 3; Homil. 28 in Num. XXXIV. In some of these passages he expressly disclaims all *canonical* authority of the book; but, out of deference to the opinion of some who had a high regard for it, he says once, on an occasion of appealing to it: "If any one pleases to receive it as a sacred book;" in Johann. p. 132, ed. Huet.

Jerome mentions the book, and calls it *apocryphal;* Catal. Scriptt. Eccl. c. 4. Comm. in Tit. i. Comm. in Psalm. 132: 3. Augustine stands in the same position, rejecting as fabulous many of the legends in the book of Enoch; De Civ. Dei, XV. 23. XVIII. 38.

From the time of Augustine down to the ninth century little or nothing appears to have been known or said of the book of Enoch. But, near the beginning of this century, G. Syncellus, a monk of Constantinople, wrote a Chronographia in Greek, in which he made very copious extracts from that book. The first two of them include ch. vii—x. 15; the other one begins with ch. xv. 8, and ends with ch. xvi. 1.* These are so copious, and withal so much in conformity with the book of Enoch which has come down to us through the medium of the Ethiopic, that no doubt can remain as to the *identity* of the two works.

It seems to have been the prevailing opinion among the ancient Christian fathers, that the apostle Jude, in vs. 14, 15 of his epistle, had quoted a passage from the book of Enoch. Even those who condemn the book as apocryphal, admit this, and endeavour to account for it in some way satisfactory to their own minds. In modern times, an intense interest has occasionally been awakened, in disputes about the canon of the New Testament, respecting this alleged quotation of Jude. The book of Enoch, therefore, had long been eagerly sought after and wished for; but in vain, until a recent traveller in Abyssinia discovered this curious relic there, in the Ethiopic language and incorporated by the Abyssinians with their books of the Old Testament.†

* The reader will find these extracts in Dr. Laurence's *Book of Enoch*, printed at large in the Appendix. He will also find them in Syncellus, first edited by Scaliger, and recently by Dindorf at Bonn, 2 Vol. 8vo.; they are exhibited, likewise, in Fabricius Cod. Pseudepigr. V. Test. I. p. 179 seq.

† That traveller was James Bruce, well known to the English world by his five volumes of Travels. He brought with him from Ethiopia or Abyssinia, three copies of the book of Enoch; one of which he gave to the Bodleian library at Ox-

Respecting the contents of the book thus introduced to the reader I proceed to give some account, as briefly, however, as the nature of the case will admit. It is no easy task, to give a synopsis of contents which are so multifarious and diverse; and withal, the difficulty is much augmented by the want of unity in the book, by apparent transpositions of several parts of it, and not improbably by the omission of some things which once belonged to it.

The book begins, like those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other prophets, with a superscription, in which Enoch is first spoken of in the *third* person; but after a few lines the same personage goes on to speak in the *first*. "The blessing of Enoch upon the elect and righteous, *who were to exist in the time of trouble*, rejecting all the wicked and the ungodly," is given in the inscription as the general object of the whole book; and this agrees tolerably well with the contents at large.

In like manner as in the prophets, Daniel, Zechariah, and John, angels are represented as the guides and interpreters of the seer. What he sees has, as he avers, respect "to a distant period," i. e. to the days of the Messiah.

That which is so summarily hinted in the inscription, with respect to the gen-

---

ford, another to the royal library at Paris, and a third he kept for himself. From the copy at Oxford, Dr. Laurence, late Regius Professor of Hebrew there, gave to the world, in A. D. 1821, a translation into English, with Notes, and a Preliminary Dissertation. From this a knowledge of the contents of the singular book in question has been diffused over Europe.—De Sacy also made a translation into Latin of a small part of the book, (from the copy in the Paris Library,) which he published in the Mag. Encyc. I. p. 382 seq. In 1833, Prof. A. G. Hoffmann of Jena translated the first half of Laurence's English version into German, and published it with exegetical notes. Hoffmann had no opportunity for consulting the original, as to this part of his work. But subsequently to this, the celebrated traveller, Dr. Rüppell, brought another copy of the whole work from Abyssinia. Furnished with this, Hoffmann made a version from the Ethiopic for Vol. II. of his Commentary, in which he has, by his superior knowledge of the oriental languages, made many corrections of Laurence, (mostly minor ones), and expended great labour upon the exegetical Notes. In an Excursus, he has reviewed a recent work in England, by the Rev. Edward Murray, entitled *Enoch restitutus*, in which the English author has endeavored to show, that the present book of Enoch is *fragmentary*, being made up of several different writings, and that the book quoted by Jude (vs. 14, 15) was a very different and much smaller book than the present. The superior knowledge of the subject, which Hoffmann possessed, easily enabled him to show how unsafe in criticism, and also how illogical, the leading positions of Murray are. It needs something more than confident assumption and unrestrained imagination, to criticise on an obscure work of antiquity. The second Vol. of Hoffmann was published in 1838. Both volumes make 960 pages. They are the fruit of widely extended and patient study, and generally satisfy the mind of an inquirer, who seeks to understand the book of Enoch. On some points of higher criticism, the commentator shows more attachment to previously adopted views, than is satisfactory to an impartial reader; sometimes (not often) even cashiering the text, where it stands in his way. On some of these points, I feel myself unable to accord with him; but thanks are due to him for the light that he has poured in upon this dark and neglected domain of sacred literature.

eral design of the book, is, in the immediate sequel, more fully expressed: 'God will hereafter reveal himself on earth; all shall be filled with terror; the earth shall be burned up and all things in it perish; but to the righteous peace and mercy will be given, they shall all be blessed, and the glory of God shine upon them.' Then follows the passage (ch ii.) which is quoted in Jude, vs. 14, 15; to which the attention of the reader will be particularly directed in the sequel.

The discerning reader will here find the same *germ* as in the Apocalypse. Views like this are frequently repeated in the book of Enoch; which serves to show on what the mind of the writer was most intent, and how much resemblance in some respects there is, between his principal aim and that of John. Both wrote for the consolation of suffering saints.

The writer goes on: 'All nature obeys, without transgressing, the ordinances of God; the stars, the seasons, the clouds, the trees, the rivers, and seas, all obey their appropriate laws; only the *wicked* disobey, and on them no peace shall come, but eternal curses. To the righteous, however, shall be given light, peace, joy, wisdom, freedom from condemnation, long life, and everlasting happiness.' Ch. iii—vi.

Such, then, is the theme of the book proposed by the writer. He begins his exhibition of the evidence, designed to establish his positions, with an account of transactions before the flood, and during the days of Enoch.

'A number of angels (200 according to ch. 7: 7) become enamoured with some of the daughters of men, and, by the persuasion of Samyaza their leader, they enter into an agreement, sanctioned by oath on mount Hermon, to cohabit with them. This agreement they execute, teaching their paramours, at the same time, sorcery, divination, the arts of luxury and ornamental dress, and also of fabricating dyes, jewels, and instruments of war. These women, in the sequel, brought forth giants [נְפִילִים] 300 cubits high, who devoured all the productions of man which were fitted for food, and then, at last, fell upon men themselves.' Ch. vii. viii.

'The *good* guardian angels of men now make complaint to the Almighty, in regard to these outrages and violations of the laws of men and angels. An angel is immediately sent by the Most High to Noah, in order to tell him of the deluge which should come upon the earth. Raphael is also commissioned to bind Azaziel, one of the leading apostate angels, hand and foot, and cast him into darkness, and into the desert of Dudael. The earth is to be punished for its wickedness, but not utterly destroyed. Gabriel is commissioned to go and excite the giants, the mongrel breed of angels and women, to mutual slaughter. Michael is commanded to go and seize Samyaza, with his apostate fellows, and bind them for seventy generations under the earth, even to the day of judgment; also to complete the destruction of the giants.' Ch. ix. x. 1—20. Then follows a description of a kind of *millennial* state, which is to succeed the destruction of the wicked (10: 21—29); 'righteousness and equity shall abound; the saints will live each to beget a thousand children; the earth will yield, in overflowing abundance, all that ministers to want or luxury; all men will be righteous, all worship God in truth; all crime will cease; no more shall any deluge come; and everything in which men engage will be blessed.'

Enoch is now commissioned by good angels, to go and announce to the apostate angels their doom. This commission he executes, and they all become terrified, and beseech him to intercede for them. He consents, and writes down a memorial for them; but while he is reading it, he falls asleep, and is taught therein by a vision, that their doom admits of no change.

The substance of that vision is as follows: 'The prophet is caught up into heaven, where he sees a spacious palace, surrounded by crystal walls and vibrating flames of fire, and guarded by cherubim of fire. On a throne therein, which was surrounded with flaming splendour, One great in glory sat, on whom even angels could not look without being dazzled.' Ch. xii—xiv. 'By the exalted Being on this throne, Enoch is commanded to go and announce to the apostate angels their doom. The crime which they have committed is against the laws of their spiritual nature, and admits of no pardon. The giants, their ill-begotten progeny, shall beget only evil demons, who will commit all kinds of violence and oppression, and shall at last miserably perish by mutual slaughter. No mercy is to be obtained for them. Their flesh is to perish before the judgment that is coming upon them, and until the consummation of all things. No peace can ever be given to apostate angels and their offspring.' Ch. xv. xvi.

Thus concludes that part of the book which has special reference to the case of the apostate angels; and this may appropriately be named *the first* part of the book of Enoch; or, if a division of the whole be made by *books*, (as it was in the days of Syncellus who quotes ἐκ βιβλίου πρώτου), this may be called *the first* book.

The SECOND BOOK extends from ch. xvii. to ch. xxxv. 'The prophet is elevated to the top of a lofty mountain in some distant region, whence he sees the treasures of lightning and thunder, the fiery ocean in which the sun sets, and the rivers of fire which empty into it; also the mountains of gloom whence winter issues, the great abyss the source of all the streams of water, and the treasuries of the winds which are agents in all the motions of the heavenly bodies. All these were seen in the *West*.' Ch. xvii. xviii. 1—7.

'Next the Seer passes to the *South*. Here are six mountains formed of resplendent and precious stones, and blazing with fire. On the other side of them he sees an extended desert, with a great lake, and fountains of water. Over these fountains stood columns of fire, which moved up and down; over them was no firmament, and under them no solid ground. Here *seven stars* were imprisoned, which had transgressed the command of God, in respect to keeping their appointed movements. This is the place where the apostate angels appointed leaders in the matter of their transgression; and afterwards the same angels led men astray, into idolatry and other crimes, for which they shall be judged.' Ch. xviii. xix.

'Passing on nearer to this tremendous place, the Seer asks the angel, who accompanied him, to explain the ground of that severe punishment which the *stars* suffered. The answer is, that they had transgressed their laws.' Ch. xxi. 1—3.

The writer, like Origen and several of the early Fathers, believed the stars to be animated, or at least to be under the direction of animated angelic beings. Hence the *guilt* with which they are charged. This

seems to be mentioned by him, in order to inspire his readers with dread of transgressing God's holy laws.

'Going thence the angel conducts him to a dreadful place, glittering with columns of fire, which he declares to be "the prison of the [sinning] angels." Ch. xxi. 4—6. Thence he goes to Elysium or the region of the blessed, surrounded by mighty walls of rock. Hither the souls of the dead, i. e. of all the righteous, will come and dwell until the day of judgment. This place is divided into four spaces, by a chasm between the first and second, water between the second and third, and light between the third and fourth. So is it, also, with the souls of the wicked, which, in their place (under ground), are separated until the judgment-day, when they will be punished forever; there is no escape from their prison.' Chap. xxii.

'From this place the prophet is rapt into another, where he sees seven shining mountains, adorned with precious stones, and with odoriferous trees, one of which exceeded all the trees of Eden. The fruit of this tree will be given to the righteous after the judgment, and they will live forever by means of it, free from all pain and sorrow. On the seventh of these mountains, overtopping all the rest, the Lord of Glory will descend, when he shall visit the earth to reward the righteous. Chap. xxiv. Thence the prophet comes to the middle of the earth [Jerusalem], where he sees a holy mountain [Zion], with water on the eastern side flowing to the south [the brook Kidron]; also another mountain [that of Olives] on the east. Water also ran from the west [from the fountain of Siloam], and another mountain was on the south. Among these were vallies, and precipices with trees; also an accursed valley [viz. that of Hinnom]. Here blasphemers are punished, and in the judgment they shall be made an example of retribution.' Ch. xxv. xxvi.

'From this place the prophet is carried to a mountain in the desert [perhaps Sinai], full of trees, water, and cataracts; thence to another place to the eastward of this, which was full of choice, odoriferous, and medicinal trees; from this he sees another place, with plenty of never failing water and goodly trees; then he sees another mountain containing trees loaded with the most sweet-smelling fruit, from which water flowed like nectar; and on this another mountain full of trees with fruit of surpassing odour.' Chap. xxvii—xxx.

'Thence, surveying "the entrances of the *north*," he perceived seven other mountains, replete with new and odoriferous trees. Passing these, and going over the Erythraean Sea [Gulf of Akaba?], far beyond it he beheld the garden of righteousness [Eden], with trees numerous, large, fragrant, beautiful, and among them *the tree of knowledge*, like a species of the tamarind tree. Raphael informs him, that this was the tree of which his ancient progenitors ate. Ch. xxxi. Thence he is conducted toward the extremities of the earth, where large beasts and birds of various forms are seen; and to the eastward of these he comes to the ends of the earth and the heavens; and there he sees the gates of heaven open, whence issued all the stars, which, by the help of his guide, he numbered and recorded, together with their times and seasons. Thence he goes to the extremities of the north, where he sees the gates whence issue the northern winds, cold, hail, frost, dew, and rain. Thence he is taken to the gates at the western extremity; and thence to those of the south, from which issue dew, rain, and wind. Thence he goes back again to the east, in order to review the courses of the stars.' Ch. xxxiv—xxxv.

Here begins a new vision, "the vision of wisdom," to be communicated in 103 parables, [De Sacy reads *three;* and only three are con-

tained in the book]. It extends from ch. xxxvii. to ch. lxx, and constitutes by far the most interesting and important part of the book, inasmuch as here the whole of the author's *Christology* is displayed. The usual appellation here of the divine Being, is *Lord of spirits*, which occurs scores of times.

FIRST PARABLE. 'The time of judgment and of the separation of the righteous and wicked is coming, when endless woe will be to the wicked; but peace and happiness to the righteous. "The holy and elect race" shall descend from heaven and dwell with men. The prophet is then taken up to heaven, and sees the habitation of the saints with the angels. Their number is countless, and they continually bless and praise God. He earnestly desires to remain there. Myriads stand before the Lord of spirits; and on the four sides of him are four archangels, who in different ways address him, praising him, and supplicating for success in the discharge of the different tasks assigned them. Ch. xxxviii—xl. After this the secret places of paradise are shown to Enoch, and there he sees the receptacles of all the various agents in nature, thunder, wind, dew, hail, etc.; also of the moon with all her phases, and of the stars with all their phenomena. These last shine with no changing or borrowed light.' Ch. xli—xliv.

PARABLE THE SECOND. This parable specially exhibits the author's *Christology*. The title of the parable (ch. 45: 1) gives us to understand, that it respects those "who deny the name of the Lord of spirits, and who will be judged and punished by the ELECT ONE," [the Messiah].

'The Elect One shall dwell in the midst of the righteous, changing the face of heaven and earth; excluding the wicked from them. The Ancient of Days will give to the Elect One full power to subdue all opposition, to humble all kings and princes who resist him, and expel the Lord of glory from their temples.—The blood of the righteous shall be avenged; the supplications of the holy ones on account of their blood, viz. that it may be avenged, will be heard. *The* SON OF MAN *is invoked before the Lord of spirits, and was invoked before the creation of the sun and stars.* All shall worship him. THE ELECT ONE WAS WITH GOD BEFORE THE WORLD WAS. The righteous will he protect; the wicked will he cast into the fire. The glory and power of the Elect One are eternal; he will judge secret things.' Ch. xlv—xlviii.

'The saints shall live in glory; the wicked be overwhelmed with evil; but space for repentance shall be given; and those who do not repent shall never find mercy. The earth and Hades shall deliver up their dead to be judged; the righteous shall be separated from the wicked, and filled with joy and peace.' Ch. xlix. l.

'Enoch is now transported once more to the West, by a whirlwind. There he sees six mountains of different metals, all of which are to be appropriated to the use of the Messiah, [comp. Is. 45: 9, "I will give thee the treasures of darkness."] All of these shall dissolve at his coming, and no more use be made of them to fabricate arms of opposition. Ch li.—A deep valley is also seen there by the prophet, and all men bring their presents and offerings thither [to propitiate the Messiah]; but such as have filled their hands with iniquity and the fruits of rapacity shall perish, while the righteous endure forever. There the angels of punishment were preparing their deadly weapons to smite sinners, and to destroy kings and the powerful ones of the earth; but the righteous shall be relieved from the vexation of sinners. Ch. lii. Thence Enoch is brought to another part of the earth,

to a deep valley burning with fire, [the valley of Hinnom, see chap. xxvi]. To this the kings and the mighty, who had been oppressors, are brought; and here they are bound with fetters of iron that have no weight;' [comp. chains of darkness, Jude v. 6. 2 Pet. 2: 4]. Ch. liii.

Here comes in a paragraph which seems like an interpolation, it being a description merely of the flood in Noah's time. It extends from 53: 7 to 54: 5. 'After this, the prophet sees in a valley, the sinning angels in chains, and also their paramours and offspring, [the giants].—Subsequent to this the princes of the Parthians and Medes shall come and remove kings, and tread upon the land of the elect. Their course, however, shall be arrested; but the people of the land will be destroyed by mutual slaughter, and the mouth of Hades shall be much enlarged. Ch. liv. After this Enoch sees another army of chariots coming upon the wind, from the east, west, and south, [the invading Romans]. Their noise shakes the whole earth. Ch. lv.

THIRD PARABLE. 'Peace shall be to the saints, and God will be their everlasting light.—The secrets of the lightning are now shown to Enoch; also of the thunder; both when they are for a blessing and for a curse. Ch. lvi. lvii. In the 500th year of Enoch's life the heavens and the earth shook violently, the Ancient of Days was seen on his throne of glory, surrounded by myriads of angels; the time of judgment and punishment, as well as of reward, comes; to the righteous Leviathan and Behemoth are given for their feast; while the wicked are severely punished. Ch. lviii.

'Another angel now proceeds with the prophet, and discloses to him all the secrets of the agencies of nature, e. g. of the winds, moon, lightning, ebb and flow of the sea, mist, rain, darkness, light, etc. Ch. lix.—Angels go to the north, with measures for the righteous, that they may be brought to dwell with the elect, and be able to measure or scan their portions and all the secrets of nature. All unite to bless, praise, and glorify the Lord and his Elect One. The Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophannim, and "all the angels of the Lords, viz. of THE ELECT ONE AND OF THE OTHER POWER, *who was upon the earth over the water on that day*," bless and praise him—all holy beings in the universe shall bless and praise the Lord of spirits. Ch. lx. The Lord of spirits summons kings and princes to comprehend, if they can, his Elect One. He seats himself upon the throne of judgment, and brings the ungodly to trial. Anguish will seize upon the wicked, when they behold the *Son of woman* sitting on the throne of his glory. All shall glorify "Him who has dominion over all things, Him who was concealed," viz. the Son of man, "who from the beginning existed in secret;" all the elect shall stand before him, all kings and princes fall down and worship him. "*They shall fix their hopes on this Son of man, and pray to him, and petition to him for mercy.*" But all the ungodly shall be dragged away to punishment, while the righteous shall be made joyful before him, and dwell with the Son of man forever. The saints, *who have been raised from the earth*, will be clothed with the garment of life. This garment is with the Lord of spirits. Ch. lxi. Tyrant kings will then be punished, that rest may be given to the saints for a time. They shall praise God for the rest thus given to them. Oppressors cannot find this rest. They are constrained to acknowledge that God's judgments are just. They shall be thrust out from the presence of the Son of man. The apostate angels, who have seduced men, will be punished by him.' Ch. lxii. lxiii.

Chs. lxiv—lxvii. contain a vision of Noah respecting the flood; which is plainly interpolated here; or at least inserted in a wrong place. It

has respect to Enoch, only inasmuch as Noah repairs to him for the explanation of things seen by the former in a vision.

'In ch. lxviii. the names of twenty-one apostate angels are given, who were active in misleading the others, and also their various characters and offences. All shall be judged by the Son of man, and his word shall be all-powerful in presence of the Lord of spirits.—Here, it is said, ends the *third* parable; but ch. lxix. lxx. are plainly a continuation consisting of homogeneous matter. The prophet sees the Son of man exalted by all on earth and in heaven. After being lifted up to the heaven of heavens, Enoch there sees the pellucid and glittering palace of the Ancient of Days, and also angels, archangels, and saints, worshipping before him. He falls down and worships. He is commended and blessed, and a promise of perpetual peace and happiness is made to him.' Ch. lxvii—lxx.

Chaps. lxxi—lxxxi. exhibit the author's peculiar system of astronomy or astrology. They respect the sun, moon, winds, mountains of frost, the parent-fountains of water, etc.; and they treat of all the phenomena and changes of these. They are a most singular exhibition of ignorance in matters of science combined with a kind of acuteness, and of ideas resulting merely from ocular inspection mixed with speculative reasoning upon the nature of things. It would be a welcome contribution to the history of astronomy, if some such man as Ideler would become a commentator upon this *unique* system of nature. No one with acquisitions less than his, in this department of science, would be able, I think, to unravel the intricacies of this section. Hoffman has done much to clear up its obscurities, but not all which is desirable. In ch. lxxxi. Enoch commands Methuselah his son to preserve with care all which he has written down respecting these matters.

'Other visions of Enoch are also communicated to Methuselah. He was premonished, in vision, of the flood; and his father Mahalaleel enjoined it upon him to intercede for the earth. His prayer is accepted, in regard to a small remnant of men.' Ch. lxxxii. lxxxiii.

'Another dream of Enoch discloses, under the imagery of black and white cows and bulls, the history of Adam's posterity; of the apostate angels, as intermingling with them; of the punishment of the antediluvians; of Noah's ark, the flood, etc., as related in the Scriptures. The history of Moses, Saul, David, Solomon, etc., is continued under the symbol of *sheep*.' This is carried on, although in a very obscure and unattractive manner, down to a period near the Christian era. One can hardly recognize the author of the preceding part of the book in these chapters. Some of these representations are not only obscure, but parts of them are absolutely loathsome. Ch. lxxxiv—lxxxix. For the most part, however, Hoffmann has given satisfactory explanations.

Ch. xc. contains 'an address of Enoch to all his posterity, in which he gives them moral warning and exhortation. Ch. xci. is made up of the like matter. Ch. xcii—civ. contain addresses of Enoch to his children respecting "the elect of the world, the plants of righteousness." A period of *ten weeks* is named, into which the whole course of time is distributed. In the succession of these, the author refers to the deluge, to Abraham, to the law, to the temple of Solomon, to Elijah, to the Babylonish captivity, and to the corrupt Jews in their exile. The

eighth week is one of righteousness in which judgment shall be executed upon oppressors; and in it the house of the great King shall be built up; (which probably describes the Maccabaean period). In the *ninth* week the judgment of righteousness shall be revealed, and the world prepared for destruction; (a generic view of the Messianic period). On the *seventh* day of the *tenth* week, everlasting judgment shall be executed on the apostate angels, and a new heaven and a new earth appear. Who is capable of comprehending the works of God, or who can count the number of the stars, etc.?'

Ch. xciii. contains an exhortation to righteousness, with a description and reproof of the ways of the wicked. Chaps. xciv—xcix. contain denunciations of the wicked, and particularly of oppressors and persecutors. This is by far the noblest *moral* part of the book, and approaches near the paraenetic strains of the Old Testament prophets. It evidently flows from a mind deeply sympathizing with the suffering and persecuted righteous. 'In the hands of the Most High are all the elements, and all things; who can resist him? Ch. c. Who will dare to murmur against him? God will be terrible to the wicked; the righteous, after all their persecution and sufferings, will enjoy eternal peace. By a most solemn oath, assurance is given of this. The sufferings of the righteous are described. The righteous are exhorted to persevere, and repeated assurance of rich reward is given. To them shall books be given, books of joy and great wisdom —books in which they believe and rejoice, [New Testament?]. Enoch's posterity shall instruct men in those days; God and his Son will forever hold communion with them. Ch. cii—civ. In ch. cv. Enoch again reverts to the antediluvian period, and tells us of the extraordinary appearance of Noah, when first born; so extraordinary that Lamech, his father, repaired to Enoch in order to know the meaning of it. Enoch tells him that a flood is coming, and that his child [Noah] is destined to survive it, because of his holy character.'

'*Another* book also Enoch wrote, respecting *the latter days*. Flaming fire will consume all the ungodly and oppressors. But those who have laboured and suffered in their bodies, and have loved God, renounced the world with its riches, and *given their bodies to torment*, and been tried by the Lord, shall obtain a rich reward.' Ch. cv.

The whole work ends with a wish, that "the benediction of Enoch's prayer, and the gift of his appointed period, may be with his beloved; Amen."

It would not comport with my present object to pursue a critical examination of this book, in all its details. This would furnish matter for a volume. But so far as this production has a bearing on the spirit of the age in which it was written, and can be brought into comparison with the Apocalypse, it well deserves a serious notice. A few remarks must be made on (*a*) *The place where the book was written.* (*b*) *The time when.* (*c*) *Its probable author.* (*d*) *On that part of its contents which has respect to the sufferings of the righteous, and also to the future period of their prosperity and glory.*

(*a*) *Place where the book was written.* By this is meant, not the particular district or town wherein it was actually composed, but the *country* to which its author probably belonged.

There can be no good ground for hesitation, that its author was an *oriental* man; by which I here mean, a man not of western, but of *middle* Asia; most probably of some part of the ancient Media, or of its tributary provinces high up between the Caspian and the Black Seas. In chap. 71: 18, 19, he speaks of the day as comprising eighteen parts, twelve of which, at a certain time of the year, are light, and six dark; i. e. the day is sixteen hours long (as we express it), and the night eight hours. This could never happen in Palestine; inasmuch as the latitude is too near the equator to admit of so much inequality. The country, where the days are exactly of the length here named, must be not far from the 49th degree of latitude; and of course, strictly considered, the country must be high up, even above the Caspian and Euxine Seas. But inasmuch as the author is describing the complete course of the sun, and all the gradations of day and night which (so far as he knows) this occasions, it is not necessary to suppose that he lived in the very place where the day might be twice as long as the night, but only in such a part of the world as that he would probably come to a knowledge of such a fact. Ancient Media or Persia, where astrology flourished so much and so long among the Magi, would therefore be the most probable region which we can assign to him. On the supposition that he was a Hebrew, (of which there can be no doubt, as we shall see in the sequel), there is no difficulty in finding a home for him in that region. So early as 721 B. C. the king of Assyria carried away a great portion of the ten tribes into "the cities of the Medes," 2 K. 17: 6. Among those who assembled at the feast of Pentecost, soon after the resurrection of the Saviour, were "Parthians, Medes and Elamites" [Persians], most or all, no doubt, of Jewish origin. Many thousands of Jews, we well know, were scattered over all parts of middle Asia, who had become so attached to the countries whither they had been transported, that they never returned from their exile, even after permission for return was given.

What makes much for the supposition now in question is, that throughout the whole book, light, fire, splendour, radiance, are almost everywhere made so conspicuous. This seems to indicate, that the author had been brought up in a country whose religion was *Parsism*. One needs but to open the Zend-Avesta, in order to feel that the very basis, and (one might almost say) a great portion of the essential ingredients of Parsism, consist of light and splendour. Oromasd himself seems to have been regarded by the Magi as being formed from *Urlicht*, or (as we must express it in our own language) *parent-light*. One circumstance in particular may be noted, where the author adverts to views respecting the other world, which in all probability he had unconsciously obtained from those who surrounded him. In 61: 18, he speaks

of the saints, after the resurrection, as being "clothed with the garment of life." He then adds: "That garment of life is with the Lord of spirits, in whose presence your garment shall not wax old, nor your glory diminish." The idea of 'garments being *laid up* or *kept* in heaven for the clothing of the righteous,' is familiar in the system of Zoroaster, where the *Gahs*, (female Izeds or angels of the second order), are represented as employed in fabricating garments which are kept in store for the righteous. Unconsciously the author seems to have intermingled this peculiarity of Parsism with his own conceptions; for the Scriptures, which present us often with the idea of splendid costume as appropriate to the righteous in a future world (Rev. 3: 4, 5, 18. 4: 4. 6: 11. 7: 9, 13), lack the peculiar trait to which I have just adverted. The Ascension of Isaiah abounds in this peculiarity (see p. 49); and the reader by consulting the passage referred to, will find the evidences of it placed before him, with references also to the Zend-Avesta. In my remarks on the Ascension of Isaiah, in the paragraph to which reference has just been made, I have stated my reasons for supposing, that the author of that work was a Hebrew of Middle Asia. The cast of the composition in the present case, in many respects, leads me to a like view of the country of the author. I acknowledge that the ground is not entirely certain; for a writer of western Asia could exhibit the like traits. No one of the circumstances mentioned would be sufficient of itself to establish my position; but a *combination* of them all leads me to the feeling, that this position is probably correct. It seems probable, that neither the author of Enoch nor of the Ascension of Isaiah would designedly introduce Parsism; but if they were educated in a country where the common idiom of the people had embodied it in their language and modes of expression, it would be difficult to avoid some developments of it.

Lücke suggests, that some things in the book favour the idea that it was written in Egypt, p. 64. But I find nothing in it which leads to this, unless it be its *astronomical* speculations; which, however, may quite as well be attributed to the East, as to Egypt. The habitual reckoning of the year at 364 days, shows that the author belonged to a country which is neither in extreme western Asia nor eastern Africa. It remains as yet unknown whence this reckoning comes. The *localities*, in parts of the book, show beyond a doubt that the author was in some degree familiar with the geography of Palestine; e. g. in chap. 13: 8, 9, where Hermon, Dan, and Lebanon occur; in 25: 1 seq., where we have the special localities of Jerusalem; and in 31: 2, where the desert [of Arabia] and the Erythraean Sea come before us. But all this makes nothing against the eastern home of the writer; inasmuch as more or less of the pious Jews of all countries often visited Palestine, in order to worship there.

(*b*) *Time when the book was written.* Dr. Laurence thinks this can be ascertained almost with exact certainty, from the nature of some of its contents. The substance of his argument may be briefly stated. (1) It must have been written *before* the epistle of Jude; for Jude quotes from it, and quotes in such a way as to show that he supposed his readers to be already familiar with the book. (2) It was written *after* the book of Daniel; because it often quotes from this book, and everywhere shows a familiar acquaintance with it, and an effort to imitate it. Here we have then, limits within which the book of Enoch must have been composed. But, (3) From ch. lxxxiii. to ch. xc. is an allegorical history or picture of all the leading events recorded in the Old Testament history. The people of Israel are represented as *sheep;* and Saul, David, and Solomon, are first distinctly alluded to as their *shepherds.* After these it is said that *seventy* shepherds ruled over them. These are distributed into *three* classes; (*a*) *Thirty-seven** kings of Judah and Israel. Such is in fact the number, if we omit Zimri, deposed after seven days; Tibni, the rival of Omri, who can hardly be said to have actually attained to sovereignty; and Shallum, who reigned but one month; all three being of the ten tribes. To make out the number in question, then, we must include the twenty kings of Judah and the seventeen kings of Israel. (*b*) *Twenty-three* shepherds constitute the second class; and these are plainly the *foreign* kings of Babylon and Persia, and also the kings of Macedonian origin both in Syria and Egypt; viz. Babylonian 4, Persian 11, Macedonian 8, = 23; see names in Laurence, p. XXVII. (*c*) *Twelve* native Jewish princes, beginning with Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus, and ending with Herod. Now inasmuch as no more than twelve are comprised in this last class, Dr. Laurence concludes, that the author must have lived and written during the time of Herod; otherwise he would have included in his list Herod's three sons who reigned after him, and among whom Herod's dominions were divided, and also Agrippa who reigned over the whole province of Judea. This would have increased the numbers, under the third class, to sixteen; or, in case we begin the reckoning with Judas Maccabaeus, to fifteen.

This representation appears plausible, at first view. But a closer examination of it than Dr. Laurence has made, brings serious difficulties to light, which he has overlooked. In ch. 89 : 25, the *twelve* shepherds or princes, whom he reckons as *native* Jews, are spoken of in such a way, as on the whole to render this mode of reckoning quite improbable. According to this passage, an angel presents to the Lord "the book of the

* Dr. Laurence reads *thirty-five*, because the whole number added together would make seventy-two instead of seventy. But there is no need of this change. The number seventy is used *symbolically;* and consequently a little more or less will make no important difference. So Lücke and Hoffmann.

destruction *which the last twelve shepherds wrought*, and points out, before the Lord of the sheep, that they destroyed more than those who preceded them." So Laurence; but Hoffman remarks, that Laurence has omitted the *demonstrative* before *twelve shepherds*, and that the Ethiopic obliges us to translate thus: *Which* THOSE *twelve shepherds wrought.* This gives an entire new turn to the whole passage, and necessarily refers the shepherds to that class of which the writer had been speaking; and these are beyond all reasonable question, *foreign* kings who had exercised dominion over Judea. On turning back to ch. 89: 7, we find twenty-three shepherds mentioned, who bore sway during fifty-eight periods. The context in the sequel to this last passage, exhibits a symbolical representation of the struggles of the Jews for their freedom, and of the oppression and attacks of foreign powers. It would seem, then, that the fifty-eight periods extend from the time of the exile down to the time when the more violent sufferings and struggles of the Jews began. This, if we follow Hartmann, must be the period of Antiochus III. or the Great, king of Syria, during whose reign Palestine was often a theatre of war. The remaining periods to be completed, (in order to make the round number 70), are the twelve under the twelve Kings, brought to view in Enoch 89: 25, and mentioned above. Following the book of the Maccabees, Hartmann makes out twelve Syrian and Egyptian kings, from this period down to the time when Simon was elected as the Leader of the Jews, and was acknowledged and confirmed as king by Demetrius Nicator, B. C. 142; Froelich. Annales, p. 72. 1 Macc. 13: 34—42. From that period onward, temporary invasions and subjection excepted, the Jews were ruled by their own princes, until near the period when the nation was subdued and scattered by the Romans. It is easy, when viewed in such a light, to account for it why the author of Enoch should say, that "those last twelve shepherds destroyed more than those who preceded them." Antiochus Epiphanes is included among the twelve; and all the consequences that followed the struggle so earnestly begun by him to destroy the Jews, are included. But to apply this, as has been done by most, (and by myself in a former Review of the book of Enoch, Bib. Repos. XV. p. 115 seq.), since the publication of Laurence, to the *native* Jewish kings, is doing violence to history, or else to the credit of the author of Enoch. This should never be done, except in a case of absolute necessity. For particulars, in vindication of the view given above, I must refer to Hartmann's Notes, on the passages of Enoch above cited.

In confirmation of this view, it should be mentioned, that the *sequel* to Enoch 89: 25 treats of the victories obtained by the Jews over *foreign* oppressors and powers; which were completed in the time of Simon. Of course, if this view of the subject be correct, the argument of Lau-

rence, that the book of Enoch was written in the time of Herod, because the list of twelve kings is concluded with him, is not well grounded. It would seem that the list is concluded with Trypho or Demetrius, rival chiefs, during whose contest Simon came to the crown of Judea, which was made hereditary in him.

We find notices moreover, in the book of Enoch, of occurrences later than this period. The passage to which I now refer, is in ch. 54: 9, which speaks of "the Chiefs of the East, among the Parthians and the Medes," as coming up and "treading upon the land of the elect," and of their "removing kings and hurling them from their thrones;" in the sequel, however, they are represented as checked by "the city of the righteous." These events are represented, also, in the book of Enoch, as succeeded by civil war and destruction among the people of the Holy Land.

The facts which correspond with this representation are, that the Parthians overran and subdued the whole of Syria, Tyre excepted, in B. C. 41; and in the following year they entered Judea, where Antigonus, the last of the Asmonaean race of kings, was contending with Herod for the sovereignty, drove out Herod, and placed Antigonus upon the throne. Three years after this, Antigonus was displaced by the Romans, and Herod established as king in his room. The civil wars and commotions accompanying and following these events, are supposed to be what the author aims to describe, in ch. 54: 10—12. At a period immediately subsequent to this, Laurence, with whom Hoffmann (in Vol. I.) and some others agree, places the composition of the book of Enoch. But in Vol. II. Hoffmann, as we have seen, modifies this opinion.

So much is doubtless true, viz. that the composition must have been *later* than these events. How much later? is a question which these passages do not seem at all to decide. Other passages, however, in my view, direct us to a period considerably later than the one designated by Dr. Laurence. There is no need of supposing, that the author continues the history of kings in Palestine down to the day in which he lived. With the reign of Simon begins the period of Jewish independence; and besides this, the number of seventy kings is already completed, up to that period. Subsequently, the invasion of the Parthians, and of the Romans (as it seems to me), is adverted to by the author.

In chap. lv, the prophet represents himself as seeing "another army of chariots, with men riding upon them, . . . coming from the east, the west, and the south." The whole earth trembles with the sound of them, and 'their noise is heard even to the extremities of earth and heaven.' I cannot well doubt, that the invasion of Palestine by Vespasian is here designated. Laurence and Hoffmann refer it to the Roman military interpositions in behalf of Herod; but these seem to me alto-

gether too brief and insignificant to give occasion to such high wrought description as is here employed. Besides, this invasion seems to be represented, by the writer, as introductory to the completion of the kingdom of God. So the primitive Christians, it is well known, regarded the Roman invasion under Vespasian.

In ch. 89: 29 seq., after the seventy shepherds had ceased to rule, they are represented as being brought to judgment, with the apostate angels, and thrust into an abyss of fire "on the right of that house," i. e. in the valley of Hinnom. 'Hither the blind sheep, i. e. the obdurate Jews, are also brought. The *ancient* house is then immerged, save some of its choice parts, (comp. Apoc. 11: 1, 2), and "the Lord of the sheep produces a *new* house, great, and loftier than the former, which he erects in the place of the first which had been concealed," (so Hartmann); and all its pillars and ornaments are new. *To this house all worshippers from all parts of the earth come*, and the Lord of the sheep rejoices with great joy over them all.'—I am not aware of any construction of this, which is so reasonable as that which supposes it to mean the destruction of the temple by the Romans, and the building of the new and spiritual one under the Christian dispensation, with the consequent ingathering of the Gentiles. The context does not permit us to suppose, that the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar can be here meant.

Again, in ch. xcii. the author divides the whole period of the world's existence into ten weeks; not of equal length, but marked by events or persons peculiar to each. The first in his own (Enoch's) age; the second that of Noah and the flood; the third of Abraham; the fourth of the Law; the fifth of Solomon's temple; the sixth of Elijah, including the Babylonish exile at its close; the seventh is that of the corruption of many Jews, exiles among the heathen, and the conspicuous piety of a part of them; the eighth is that of Judas Maccabaeus and the restoration of Jewish worship and privileges (comp. 89: 26, 27); the ninth week is destined 'to destroy the works of the ungodly, to reveal the judgment of righteousness to the whole world, and to prepare the world for the final judgment.' On the seventh day of the *tenth* week, is to be the final judgment, and a new heavens will then be formed, "in which sin will be no more named forever and ever."

The names of the individuals who thus identify the respective weeks or periods, as presented above, are indeed not given in the book of Enoch; but such language is employed as leaves no room to doubt as to the first six periods; and in my own apprehension, there is little or no reason to doubt respecting the limits assigned to the others. In the ninth or Messianic period the author seems to have lived. If this be doubtful here, further evidence will serve to confirm it.

On grounds such as these Lücke inclines to the opinion, that the wri-

ter of the book of Enoch composed his work *after* the destruction of the temple by the Romans, and at a period when the Gospel had been spread among the Gentiles, p. 60 seq.

But I have, in a diligent and repeated perusal of the book, lighted upon passages besides these, which seem to indicate that the author lived after the period when most of the New Testament books were already written; inasmuch as there are indications, satisfactory to me, that he has not unfrequently referred to what they contain. It is difficult, perhaps, to produce *specific* evidence enough concerning this to satisfy all minds; and I must cast myself, therefore, upon the *tout ensemble* of the book, and appeal to the impression made upon such readers as have given it a repeated and scrutinizing perusal. I can, however, specificate a number of particulars, most of which seem in a good measure to have been overlooked by Laurence, Hoffmann, and even by Lücke.

Ch. 38: 2, It would have been better for them, had they never been born; comp. Matt. 26: 24. Mark 14: 21. Ch. 46: 3, 4, The Son of man . . . shall raise up kings and the mighty from their couches, and the powerful from their thrones . . . he shall hurl kings from their thrones and their dominions . . . the countenance of the mighty shall be cast down, filling them with confusion; comp. Luke 1: 51, 52. Ch. 48 *b*: 3, With him dwells the spirit of intellectual wisdom . . . and the spirit of those who *sleep* in righteousness; he [Christ] shall judge secret things; comp. the frequent idiom of the New Testament, where *sleep* is used for death, and *sleeping in Jesus* for dying in the Christian faith; comp. also, Rom. 2: 16. Ch. 24: 3 seq., Enoch sees a tree among the mountains of judgment, "goodly in aspect . . . its leaf, flower, and bark never wither . . . the sight of its fruit is delightful . . . the fruit of it shall be to the elect [after the judgment] . . . the sweet odour shall enter into their bones, and they shall live a long life;" comp. Apoc. 22: 2, 14. 2: 7.

In ch. xl, Enoch is represented as seeing countless myriads standing before the throne of the Lord of spirits, and in particular *four* archangels standing on the four sides of this throne, and severally and *successively* addressing themselves to him who sat upon it. In Apoc. iv—vi, the four *Ζῶα* are represented as occupying the same position. Inasmuch as they are there presented as rational creatures joining in the worship of God, our author would seem to have considered them as archangels. In Rev. vi. the four *Ζῶα* are presented as *successively* speaking, in like manner as in the book of Enoch. In ch. 47: 1 seq., the blood of the righteous is said to "ascend from the earth before the Lord of spirits . . . that he would execute judgment, and that his patience may not endure forever," and thanks are given by all the powers of heaven, that this supplication is accepted; comp. Rev. 6: 9 seq. 11: 16—18. Ch. 47: 3, 'The book of the living is opened, in the presence of God;' comp. Rev.

20: 12. Ch. 48: 9, 'They [the persecuting wicked] shall burn in the presence of the righteous, and sink [into the great abyss] in the presence of the holy; comp. Rev. 14: 10. In 45: 4, 5, a new heavens and a new earth are to be made for the dwelling of the righteous; comp. Rev. 21: 1. Ch. 50: 1, 'The earth shall deliver up [for judgment] from her womb, and Hades deliver up from hers that which it hath received, and destruction [אֲבַדּוֹן, the abyss] shall restore that which it owes;' comp. Rev. 20: 13.

When we attentively consider such passages as those just referred to in the Apocalypse, must we not conclude, either that the writer of the Apocalypse drew from the book of Enoch, or the author of the latter book from John? To my own mind, John presents altogether the strongest evidence of being the *original;* the author of the book of Enoch appears to be the imitator. Ewald reverses this conclusion, Comm. in Apoc. p. 9.

But we have not yet done with this subject. The *Christology* of the book of Enoch bears almost incontestable evidence of New Testament, or at least of *Christian*, origin.

In the moderate portion of the book which is directly Christological, the name *Elect* or *Elect One*, as applied to the Messiah, occurs some fifteen times; comp. Luke 23: 35, and especially 1 Pet. 2: 4. *Son of man* occurs, in the same portion of the book, at least sixteen times; *my Son*, in 104 *b*: 2; *Messiah* occurs 48: 11. 51: 4; *Son of woman* occurs in 61: 9, where he is said to sit on the throne of his glory, comp. Gal. 4: 4, *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*. All this, specially the last, seems to be too specific to be overlooked. But there is more still which exhibits the *Christian* views of the author. In 48: 2, the *Son of man* is said to be invoked before the Lord of spirits, and his name in presence of the Ancient of Days. In 60: 10 seq. the Elect One is represented as *σύνθρονος* with the Lord of spirits, and as worshipped by all the host of heaven. In 61: 9, 10, the *Son of woman* is said to be seated on the throne of glory, and all the kings and princes of the earth are represented as glorifying him.

In 60: 13 is a passage which seems, according to Laurence's version, to recognize the doctrine of the Trinity, "The Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophannim, [different orders of angels according to Jewish computation], all the angels of power, and all the angels of the *Lords*, viz. of the Elect One, and of the other Power who was upon earth over the water on that day [alluding to Gen. 1: 2] . . . shall glorify, praise, exalt, etc." This can hardly be taken for anything less than a development of trinitarian views; at all events, of such views respecting the object of truly divine worship as no uninspired Jew can be shown to have possessed, until after the promulgation of Christianity. But Hoffmann translates:

"Angels of power and all angels of lordships [i. e. who are of superior order], and the Elect and the other Powers, who were on earth over the water in that day," i. e. superior angels present and assisting at the creation. This is ingenious; but I doubt whether it expresses the mind of the writer.

The New Testament insists much on the doctrine, that the Messiah is to be the supreme and final judge of all men. So is it in the book of Enoch, e. g. ch. 50: 3. 54: 5. 60: 10, 11. 61: 9. 68: 39, 40. On his sentence depends the final destiny of all intelligent beings. Is not this a peculiarity appropriate to the New Testament dispensation? On the Son of man, moreover, all kings, princes, etc., are said to fix their hopes, to pray to him, and petition him for mercy, 61: 12, 13. And when one reads (48: 5, 6), that "*the Elect and Concealed One* existed in the presence of the Lord of spirits, before the world was created and forever; [and that] in his presence he existed, and has revealed to saints . . . the wisdom of the Lord of spirits," how can he refrain from supposing, that John 1: 1, 2, 18 was before the writer's mind, and that he has imitated even the very repetition which occurs in the Gospel of John 1: 1, 2?

I may add, also, that the book appears to be full of allusions to the persecution of the righteous and the martyrdoms which they suffered during the primitive age. I cannot produce at length the passages, for want of room; but the reader may find some of them in 46: 6. 48: 4. 40: 5. 80: 11. 52: 4—7. 1: 7. 10: 18, 19. 48 *a*: 10. 62: 1—7. chaps. xciv. —xcix. chaps. cii. ciii. 105: 23. Even these do not contain all the passages of this nature which are in the book. Among those, however, which I have here designated, are some which speak more particularly of the *peace* and *rest* to be given to the righteous. The whole tenor of the book is of such a cast, as to give special emphasis to such passages. Let the reader turn to ch. 105: 23, near its close, where no doubt can be left on his mind, that the writer has in view the same thing as John had when he wrote Apoc. 12: 11; for he has used almost exactly the same expressions.

The doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked too is frequently and strongly asserted; e. g. in 16: 5. 22: 14. 38: 6. 39: 2. 45: 2. 49: 4. 91: 3. 92: 16. 103: 5; so in several other passages.

It were easy to enlarge this view of coincidences in the book of Enoch with the New Testament, or at all events with the doctrines of Christianity. How Dr. Laurence and Prof. Hoffmann could read all this attentively, and yet come to the conclusion that the author was *a Jew who lived before the Christian era*, I cannot well imagine. Like the Apocalypse, from beginning to end the book is filled with threats to oppressors and persecutors of the righteous. From beginning to end it is filled

with matter of consolation and encouragement to the pious who are suffering. It has not only a general, but even a close, resemblance to the Apocalypse in this respect. But what was there in the state of the Jews, under the Roman power and protection, which resembled the condition here supposed? Civil and political turmoils and parties there were indeed; but no particular persecution on account of religious opinions.

Then again how can such a *Christology* be accounted for in a mere Jew, sunk in the gross darkness which immediately preceded the coming of the Messiah? Do we lack evidence, that the Jews of that day expected a mere temporal prince and conqueror for their Messiah? Surely we do not, if Targums and Talmuds, and Rabbinical productions, and the New Testament itself, may be admitted to give testimony respecting Jewish opinions. A Christology so *spiritual* as that of the book of Enoch, which entirely omits all worldly splendour and glory and plainly gives us a *spiritual Messiah*, and seemingly a doctrine of the Trinity too (60: 13); a freedom, moreover, from Jewish partialities and Hebrew prejudices against other nations—all, all proclaim a *Christian* author. A Hebrew indeed he must have been; as the numberless allusions to the Old Testament and quotations from it, and names everywhere formed from the Hebrew, sufficiently show; and also the orders of angels which he names (60: 13), and the well known Rabbinic conceit respecting the feast, at a future day, upon Behemoth and Leviathan (58: 7, 8). But a mere Jew, with the common prejudices of his nation, never would or could, as it seems to me, have written such a *Christology* as the author of the book of Enoch has produced. He never could have refrained from inveighing against the idolatrous גּוֹיִם, and exhibiting the deep feeling of superiority over them and contempt for them, which was universal among the mere Jews of that period. There is but little, moreover, in the whole book which even inveighs against idolatry; and that little is not in such a way as to show a strong sensation of Jewish pride and contempt. On the contrary, the author has in many places taken pains to show, that the Lord of spirits has prepared to extend his mercy to *all without distinction* who will yield obedience to his commands, and that he will greatly rejoice to bring all his wandering sheep back to his fold.

The angelology of the book, and in general its demonology, can be easily accounted for by the supposition, (which is altogether a probable one), that its author was a Median or Persian, and that he was only an occasional visiter in Palestine. Indeed, the Jews in general of that period were but little, if any, removed from sentiments on this subject like those in the book of Enoch. The excessive leaning of the book to imagery borrowed from fire, light, and splendour, are perfectly natural to one brought up in the midst of Parsism. The imperfect exhibition

of several important Christian doctrines, moreover, may be easily accounted for on two grounds; first, on the ground of the special design of the book, for it was not intended to be a system of Christian doctrine; secondly, on the ground that the author was but a neophyte in the Christian religion.

One remark more on the present condition of the book, should not be suppressed. In many of its parts, it bears the most evident marks of carelessness in transcribers. The *transpositions* plainly indicate this. Almost equally plain is it, that the book has suffered some *interpolations*, and some *omissions*. There are passages, (for an example of the latter), which are quoted by some of the fathers, that are not to be found in our present copy of this work. In the apocryphal writing entitled *the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs*, an undoubted production of the first century or of the beginning of the second, there occur, as has been stated, no less than ten quotations from the book of Enoch, all except one appealing to him by name. In some of these are predictions of evil to the Jews, and predictions of what would be done by them to the Messiah and his followers, which would place the matter of Christian authorship beyond all question, in case we could fully fix upon them as real extracts from this book. E. g. in Test. Levi, ch. 16, in Test. Nepht. ch. 4, and in Test. Benj. ch. 9, are passages which render it impossible to mistake the character of the writer. The only difficulty here is, that we cannot with certainty tell exactly where the author of the Testaments designed to *conclude* his quotations, inasmuch as his own accompanying words very much resemble, in their tenor, what is probably quoted from the book of Enoch. On the whole, it seems probable that the book of Enoch has been early tampered with by the Jews; that some of its obnoxious contents have been expunged or altered, and perhaps some things of no great moment been added.

Lücke is decidedly of the opinion, that the book before us was written during the *latter* half of the first century, Einleit. p. 60. Of the same opinion is Dr. Nitzsch, in his De Test. XII. Patriarcharum, p. 17 seq. On p. 31 he remarks, that this book, *cum aetate et ingenio*, is not much remote from the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs; which agrees with Lücke's views as above stated. These writers are no ordinary judges, in respect to such a subject. De Sacy and Ewald are also of the same opinion, for substance, as to the age of the work.

(*c*) *Probable author of the book.* His person is unknown, and there is nothing in the book which would lead us even to a conjecture as to his name. We have already seen, that in all probability he was an *oriental* man, a Jew, a *Christian* Jew; and, we may add, probably a *neophyte* in the Christian religion, who was but partially instructed, and

who had visited Palestine and there been converted, and there persecuted.

(*d*) As to those contents of the book of Enoch which closely resemble the Apocalypse, with regard to the persecution of the righteous, and the certain prospect of future deliverance; they are too numerous to be recounted here. I have already adverted (on p. 69) to passages which bring the sufferings of the pious to view. I must content myself, at present, with merely referring the reader to some of the *millennial** passages contained in the book; e. g. Ch. 1: 6—8. 6: 9. 10: 21—29 (full statement). 38: 1—6. 39: 1. 45: 4 seq. 48: 10, 11. 49: 1. 50: 5. 51: 4. 52: 6, 7. 92: 15—18. 103: 1—12. 104: 1, 2. 105: 26, 27. Not every passage here noted affords by itself satisfactory evidence of millennial views; but when the whole are examined in their connections, such views can hardly remain a matter of doubt. There is a leading and prominent sympathy common to this writer and that of the Apocalypse.

On the whole, one cannot wonder at the deep interest manifested in the early ages of Christianity, in the production before us. Some parts of it exhibit no small measure of lofty conception in regard to the Godhead and the world of spirits. Throughout there is a deep tone of moral feeling, and the close of the book seems almost worthy of a place in the canon, among the comminatory parts of some of the prophets. A part of the *demonology* of the book cannot find any credence at the present day, among enlightened men; but the early fathers found here only what was congenial with their own speculations. The *astronomical* part of the book shows the author to be, in all probability, one who was educated in the midst of the גְּזֵרִין חוֹרִי of the oriental regions. A competent interpreter might educe from it many things interesting to the *history* of astronomical science. Indeed the book throughout is exceedingly rich in the disclosure of the sympathies and the speculations, and also of the modes of expression and thought, that were current in the first age of Christianity. It throws light on the angelology and demonology of the New Testament; on the current Christology of the first century; and on many things of a subordinate nature. It is worthy of much more attention, in these respects, than it has hitherto received among critics.

Quotation by Jude. The reader, who has not access to the book, will be pleased to see the passage which Jude is generally supposed to have quoted, exhibited in such a way that he can make a comparison for himself. I shall therefore subjoin it.

---

* I do not mean by *millennial*, that the period of a thousand years is expressly designated in the book of Enoch; but only the *character* of the millennial days is intended to be designated by the word, as I employ it.

JUDE, vs. 14, 15.	ENOCH, ch. ii.
Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard *speeches* (σκληρῶν) which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.	Behold, he [the Lord] cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done, and committed against him.

The quotation of Jude, (if it be truly one), is evidently paraphrastic, and such an one as would be made *memoriter* very naturally. The designation, in Jude, of *hard speeches* (σκληρῶν) was probably occasioned by the character of the times and the circumstances in which Jude wrote.

After all that has been said on the subject of this quotation, hardly anything new can be added. De Sacy remarks upon it, that "the author of the book of Enoch may have quoted from Jude, as well as Jude from him." To this Hoffmann objects, that 'then the circumstance, that *Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied*, must have been interpolated; of which we have no proof.' But this does not follow of necessity. Jude and the author of the book of Enoch may have both quoted from traditionary remains of ancient history; like Paul's allusion to Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. 3: 8, or like Jude's account of the contest of Michael the archangel about the body of Moses, in v. 9 of his epistle. The two passages are not so identical as to render quotation certain, either on the one side or on the other. Probable I must deem it to be, that Jude has quoted the book of Enoch, because he seems, in what he says of "the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their habitation, and are reserved in chains of darkness," to allude to the account of apostate angels as given in the book of Enoch. Beyond this I should not deem it safe to go. That Jude assumes the truth of what seems to be quoted, must be admitted; but it is not of course untrue, or fictitious, because it is found in the book of Enoch. Nor is the whole book of Enoch any more vouched for in consequence of this quotation, than are the poems of Aratus and Epimenides when Paul quotes them; see in Acts 17: 28 and Tit. 1: 12.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE BOOK. This Lawrence supposes to have been *Hebrew*, inasmuch as all the proper names are of Hebrew origin; the author was a Jew; and the book of Zohar, the most ancient of all the Cabbalistic books, appeals to the book of Enoch as authoritative, which, it is thought, he would not do, in case the book had been written in *Greek*, for that would show upon the very face of it that Enoch could not have been the author. Hoffmann agrees with this

opinion; De Sacy seems to doubt; at any rate, Lücke does not regard these arguments as convincing, p. 65 seq.; and long ago, from the state of the fragment quoted in G. Syncellus (see on p. 52), Heidegger, Witsius, and Hottinger, maintained a Greek original. On the supposition that an oriental Jew composed it, it would be most probable that the original language was Hebrew. But if it were, it must have been very early translated; for Jude, the author of the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, and Tertullian, manifestly appear to have read it in Greek, and quoted it as such. The Ethiopic version, moreover, must doubtless have been made from a *Greek* copy; for in 7: 8 it has *Armonem* (beginning with ʾ = א) derived doubtless from the Greek *Ἐρμῶν*, and not from the Hebrew חֶרְמוֹן. So in 10: 24 *elias* (Gr. *ἐλαίας*) is put for *oil;* 20: 7, *ikisat* probably for *ἰκισάτ*, which seems to be the Greek imitation of חַכְּסָא, *throne;* 30: 1, *nekatro* for the Greek *νέκταρος*. Besides; all the Scriptures quoted, as a general thing, are derived from the Greek version of the Scriptures.

There remains more yet to be done for the illustration of this valuable piece of *antique*, than has been done, even by Hoffmann who has made a very laudable beginning. Would that some adequate and impartial connoisseur of antiquity might pay still more attention to a commentary upon this production!

As it relates to the Apocalypse, Ewald is the only commentator whom I have seen, that has made use of the book of Enoch. He takes it for granted that it was written *before* the Apocalypse, and so makes John often an imitator of it. That the reverse of this is true, I cannot, after repeated perusals of both books, entertain any question. *Originality* of plan and execution lies on the face of the Apocalypse, on the symmetry of its design, and the vivid freshness of its costume and modes of expression. Deeply imbued was the writer with a knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures; most familiar in his mind were Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah; but after all, the thoughts and words are strictly his own. They everywhere receive the colouring of his own mind. It is not so in the book of Enoch.

(c) Fourth Book of Ezra.

Such is the name now usually given to an apocryphal book of Ezra, of early origin, in consequence of Jerome's so naming the Latin version of this book, which has in general been the only one in use among the learned. In the Codex Coisl. of Montfaucon, p. 194, it is named (among other apocryphal books) as *Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις*. The inscription of the Latin version itself names it *the second book of Ezra;* at least the inscription to the version which comprises chaps. i. ii. xv. xvi. so names

it; but these chapters, as we shall see in the sequel, are interpolations. The Arabic and Ethiopic versions of this book, which begin with chap. iii, both name it the *first* book of Ezra. This variety of names doubtless sprung merely from different modes of arranging and publishing the several books, that bore the title of Ezra. The proper book of Ezra was counted by Jerome as the *first;* Nehemiah as the *second;* the Greek Ezra in the Septuagint version as the *third;* and the book before us as the *fourth.* In some Mss., moreover, chap. xv. xvi. of the *fourth* of Ezra are reckoned as a separate book, and called the *fifth* book of Ezra.*

In the second century Clement of Alexandria quoted from a Greek copy of this book; so that we have an assurance in this, both of its early origin and of the language in which Clement found it. See Strom. 3: 16, where a passage is quoted from Ez. 5: 35, and then Clement adds: *Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει.* There is little doubt that Clement regarded the book as of good authority. Such was the case also with other fathers of the church. Ambrose regarded it as an inspired book; see, De Bono Mortis, c. 10. 11, and Comm. ad Lucam 2: 21. Vigilantius appealed to it, in the days of Jerome, in order to confirm a sentiment of his; but was severely rebuked by that veteran critic. Even in modern times the book has had its advocates; but the general sentiment, both in ancient and in modern times, has been strongly against its canonical claims.

The composition before us bears many marks of having been much tampered with, by addition, by abscission, and also by imitation. Chap. i. ii. and xv. xvi. are not only omitted in the Arabic and Ethiopic copies of the book, but twelve out of thirteen Latin Mss. at Oxford also omit them, so that no doubt can remain, on critical ground, that they must be rejected. The tenor of them moreover is such, that they are incompatible with the older part of the work, viz. ch. iii—xiv.—Besides this, the Arabic and Ethiopic copies insert large paragraphs, amounting to a chapter in extent, after chap. 7: 35 in the published Latin copy. In this case, however, the congruity of the portion inserted by these versions, with the context, is a strong proof of its genuineness.

It has been maintained by some critics of name, that the book was

* The Greek original of this book has been supposed to be lost; but suggestions have recently been made, that it may probably be found in the library at Paris; see Thilo, Acta Thomae, Proleg. p. 82. At present we have the *Latin* version, which is ancient; the Ethiopic, made some time after the middle of the fourth century, i. e. after Ethiopia was christianized; and the Arabic version, the age of which is uncertain. The Arabic version, in a Ms. of the Bodleian library at Oxford, was translated into English by S. Ockley, and published by Whiston in his *Primitive Christianity*, Vol. IV. The Ethiopic also has been translated into Latin and English, and published by Dr. Laurence, of Oxford, in A. D. 1820, one vol. 8vo.

originally written in *Hebrew*. That the style everywhere Hebraizes, as it now appears in the Latin version, is evident enough to every one acquainted with the Hebrew idiom; e. g. excedens excessit; viventes vivere; proficiscens profectus sum; numero numeravit; odiens odisti, etc. etc. very often repeated; besides a great many phrases altogether in the Hebrew manner of expression. But still, a Hebraizing Greek writer might employ the like expressions, as the Septuagint often does; the evidence, therefore, of being written in Hebrew is somewhat dubious. It rests rather upon conjecture than testimony. *Greek* the copy must have been, which was quoted by Clement of Alexandria; and the Latin translation not unfrequently betrays a Greek original; e. g. by such words as *pausa*, *plasma*, *plasmatio*, *romphaea*, etc.

The interest that we have in this book, in regard to *apocalyptic* matter, is but moderate. Only a small part of it is kindred in its form to the Apocalypse, and still less bears any near relation to the specific matter of the Revelation. There is, however, this general trait of resemblance to the Apocalypse in the fourth book of Ezra, viz. it proffers consolation and hopes of better times to the suffering Jews; and, as the Latin text is now presented to us, it contains a few *Messianic* passages. Lücke has given the book an extensive examination, and bestowed much more labor and time upon it than on the book of Enoch. It is of immeasurably less interest, however, to the critical reader; and instead of forty pages devoted by him to this book and twenty-five to the book of Enoch, I would that the case had been reversed; although one can scarcely help following such a writer as Lücke with pleasure, wherever he leads the way.

I proceed to a brief sketch of the contents of the book. Chap. i. and ii, it will be remembered, are undoubtedly an interpolation.

Chap. i. begins by tracing the genealogy of Ezra back to Aaron. It contains severe 'reproof of the Jews for all their departures from God, and recites at length, in order to aggravate their guilt, the numerous interpositions of the divine Being in their favour, during past ages. It declares that God will give their land to another people, who will believe on him without signs, wonders, or prophets, i. e. (as I understand the assertion), who will be converted by the instrumentality of simple preaching.

Ch. ii. repeats the threats that God will cast them off, and scatter them among the nations. God has selected a people to whom he will give up Jerusalem; and there, every kind of blessing shall await them. The tree of life shall flourish there; evil shall be eradicated; the dead shall be raised from their graves to increase the number of God's people; Isaiah and Jeremiah shall be sent to help them; twelve trees loaded with various fruits, as many fountains of milk and honey, and seven mountains covered with lilies and roses, shall be provided for their enjoyment. This is followed by hortatory matter; and this again by promises. Ezra was commissioned in Horeb [like Moses] to warn the people, but they reject him; the Gentiles (gentes) are therefore invited to expect a Saviour, who

will come *in fine saeculi* [בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים]; his followers shall be clothed with splendid garments; the number of them shall be complete. Ezra sees an innumerable multitude on mount Zion [comp. Rev. 14: 1], and among them a youthful form of lofty stature [the Messiah] distributing crowns. Ezra inquires who these are; and he is told, that they are confessors of God's name, who have departed this life, and now are crowned, [comp. Rev. 7: 13—17]; also that he who distributes the crowns, is the Son of God whom they have confessed.'

There can be no doubt that these two chapters came from the hand of some *Christian* writer. The manner in which the Jews are rebuked, the favour shown to the Gentiles, the evident imitations of the Apocalypse, together with the Messianic matter contained in them, all indicate the hand of a Christian writer. But as to the question: *When* were these chapters added to the ancient and principal work? we have no certain information which will enable us to decide it. The paucity of even Latin Mss. which contain them, shows that the addition must have been modern.

Chap. iii—xiv. form a peculiar and connected whole. The burden of the theme is, the distressed and desolate condition of the Jews, the mourning and astonishment of Ezra over it, and the hope of a better day in the sequel. If there are a few Messianic passages in this part of the book, (the only part which is genuine and ancient), still they are so few, and of such a nature, that it is doubtful whether they are not interpolations.

Chap. iii. commences with the statement, that 'Ezra, in the 30th year after the desolation of the holy city, was in Babylon, reflecting on the ruined state of his country, and that he was filled with anxiety and distress, and also with perplexity, on account of the treatment which it had received. He complains that God had made Adam to be the common father of all nations, because he sinned and was punished; the whole world, also, was punished afterwards for sin, by the flood; and after this, when men became corrupted, God selected Abraham, made a covenant with him accompanied by many promises, wrought many signs and wonders for his posterity, who still, urged by an evil heart inherited from the transgressor Adam, broke his laws and forfeited his favour,—and in consequence of all this the holy city had been devoted to destruction. But why is Jerusalem thus dealt with, while Babylon remains unpunished, which is a greater sinner still? Other nations have sinned more than Israel; why should they be spared, and Israel destroyed?'

Chap. iv. 'The angel Uriel is sent to answer the questions of the complaining seer. The angel asks him, (in order to show the folly of complaint by ignorant man), to weigh the flames of fire, to measure the quantity of the wind, or to recall the day they had then past. He does not ask about more recondite and mysterious matters, lest they might exceed the capacity of the complainant, but respecting things obvious and of continual occurrence. If Ezra cannot explain them, how can he expect to explain the deep counsels of the Almighty? The angel proposes a parable: The forest declared war against the sea, and would fain march into it in order to assail it; *vice versa*, the sea joined issue, and desired to roll in upon the forest; but neither could move from its place: so it is with the

inhabitants of the earth, they cannot scale heaven, and possess themselves of its secrets.—The seer still repeats his complaints respecting the severe and partial treatment of Israel. The angel gives him to understand, that the transitory generations of the world are not capable of perceiving all the future good which is promised to the just; that the evil heart derived from Adam still blinds and perverts them, and will do so until *the time of harvest comes*. The ingathering shall then be great. [Is not this Messianic?] The souls of the just once inquired when their harvest time would come; the archangel Jeremiel told them, that when the number of the wicked should be completed, God would bring about the time which he had decreed. Nothing can prevent this. Ezra inquires, whether the *past* time or the *future* is the most? By similitudes the angel shows him that the past time exceeds the future.

Chap. v. More corrupt times are yet to come. Then, after the third trumpet shall sound, great changes are to take place, and strange events to happen, throughout the world of nature. In the midst of all these, the unrighteousness and the misery of men shall increase. Here the angel breaks off, and commands a fast of seven days.

At the beginning of this fast, the angel Salathiel comes to Ezra and strives to console him. He refuses consolation, and proceeds with his fasting and prayer. At the end of seven days he resumes his anxiety and complaints, that the one chosen, beloved, favoured people of God should be treated with more severity than the heathen. The angel again comes, and reproves his excessive grief. He asks Ezra, whether he loves Israel more than God their Maker does? He reminds him that the subject respecting which he is so anxious, surpasses his comprehension; for he can neither number that which has not yet come, nor count the drops of rain, nor revive the flowers that have withered, nor open the treasures of the wind. Ezra wishes to know why things cannot be hastened and brought more closely together, so that the promised good may more speedily come. The angel tells him that the earth has its natural course, and so must all things else. Infants are not born of full stature; the earth too is to have its old age.'

Ch. vi. The angel continues: 'Before the creation of all the different objects now belonging to the world, all things were determined. Ezra wishes to know when the former age will end, and the latter one begin. The angel declines to tell him. Ezra again asks to know the end of the signs which had been shown him. He is commanded to listen without fear. A loud voice, as of many waters, strikes his ear, and proclaims that the days are coming in which God will begin to visit the earth, to punish the wicked, and bring to an end the humiliation of Zion. Great changes and strange events shall then take place; men shall destroy each other, and those who survive shall see salvation and the end of the present age. The hearts of men shall be changed; evil shall cease; truth and fidelity shall flourish. More is promised to be disclosed, after another fast of seven days.

After this Ezra again commences his complaint. He recites what God had done on the several days of creation; how he made Behemoth and Leviathan; finally he pleads, that Adam was made, that a chosen people was selected from his posterity, that other nations were regarded as nothing; but now, they lord it over God's people and destroy them. If the world was created for the chosen people, why then do they not possess it?'

Chap. vii. The angel again appears and tells Ezra, 'that the sea is immense, and the entrace to it a narrow channel; if this be not passed, how can one rule over the sea? A city is built full of all good things; the entrance to it is narrow, between fire and water, yet who shall enjoy the good, that will not pass through the

dangerous entrance? So this world is full of sorrow; who shall enjoy the good to come, that refuses the discipline which this occasions? Ezra ought, therefore, to cease from his complaints. The righteous will be amply rewarded; the wicked only suffer the just punishment of disobedience. The time of liberation is not far distant. My Son Jesus shall be revealed, and those with him shall be made glad in 400 years.—My Son the Christ shall die after this, and all who breathe, and seven days shall primitive silence reign over all the earth. A new age shall then come; the earth shall give up the dead; the judgment shall take place; truth, confidence, justice, rewards, shall follow, and sin forever cease. [Here the addition in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions comes in, and in a manner altogether consonant with the train of thought. The sequel presents a summary of it]. Sinners shall be plunged into the bottomless abyss; and paradise shall appear in all its glory. All the phenomena of nature will cease. A *hebdomade* of years is the destined number of these things. Ezra replies, that those are happy indeed who keep the commandments of God; but alas! how few of this character! Broad is the road which leads to destruction. The angel continues: God has created *two* worlds. There are a few precious things, and many inferior ones. The precious things are the more highly prized, because of the latter; God will rejoice the more in his elect few. Ezra complains that we were made of clay which could transgress, and endowed with reason. The brutes are better off who have no abuse of reason to account for. As the wicked are to be raised from the dead and punished, it would be better if they had never been made. The angel answers, that those who are endowed with reason and freedom are justly held accountable, for they have no excuse.

Ezra wishes to know, whether men go immediately after death to their retribution, or whether they are kept in a place of rest until the judgment day? The angel answers, that Ezra himself, being righteous, is safe; that the souls of the righteous go immediately into the presence of God; that the wicked are confined and kept for judgment. These shall mourn for seven reasons, which are given. On the other hand, when the righteous come before God, they will rejoice for as many reasons; which are also given. They shall forever behold the divine glory, and be happy in the presence of God.

Ezra wishes to know whether any time intervenes between death and retribution. The angel answers, that seven days are occupied by souls in making inspection of all things; then they enter their final abode. Ezra inquires, whether intercession for departed spirits is lawful? The angel informs him that it is useless, for their doom is fixed. [Here the addition in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions ceases]. Ezra replies, that Abraham, Moses, Samuel, etc., interceded for the wicked; why may not he then intercede in the case supposed? The answer is, that the present is a time of probation; the future is the final end, and admits of no change. Ezra still complains of the destiny of men, and says it would be better had they never been made. It were better that there were no paradise, than to see it and come short of it. The angel replies, that reward is offered to the good; which is all that ought to be required. Ezra is constrained at last to acknowledge, that the long-suffering of God is great towards perishing sinners; if it were not so, not a ten thousandth part of men could be saved.'

Chap. viii. 'The present world was made for many; the future one for few. As the earth affords abundant material for potter's vessels, but not much from which gold is extracted, so many are created, yet but few are saved. Ezra replies, that God arranges and disposes of all things by his sovereign power; that he kills and makes alive; and consequently it would be easy for him to save all,

especially his chosen people. For them he (Ezra) makes intercession, and prays God to forgive their sins. The divine indignation should be turned against the heathen, and not against his own chosen people. All men are sinners; God must not deal hardly with his people. The angel then reminds Ezra, that when a multitude of seeds are sown, all do not spring up and grow; in like manner, all men will not attain to eternal life. Ezra is assured that he is regarded with favour, and that his future happiness is certain. He is forbidden to urge the question respecting those who perish. All had liberty as free agents; they abused that liberty, and therefore are deserving of punishment. Ezra wishes to know, *when* the things signified will take place.'

Chap. ix. x. The angel tells Ezra, that the final period of the world will be preceded by great commotions of the natural elements and of nations. When such beginnings take place, the consummation must follow. The ungrateful and rebellious must be punished. Ezra ought not to inquire so much respecting these, but rather respecting the salvation of the righteous. Ezra persists in his complaint, that many perish while only a few are saved. The angel tells him that the many perish, because they are produced for no important purpose; but the few, God's chosen people, are like to a single choice grape on a large cluster. Here Ezra is commanded to go into a field, Ardath [Arphad?] for seven days, yet not to fast, but to live on the flowers. At the end of this period he again makes confession, and intercedes for his people. Soon after this he sees a woman weeping and mourning. He strives to comfort her; but in vain. She tells him that for thirty years she was barren. God then, in answer to her earnest prayers, gave her a son. When he had grown up, on his wedding day he fell down dead. Great mourning followed, and she fled into the field, where she is resolved to remain inconsolable until death. Ezra reproves her, and bids her consider how much more reason the country has to weep for its multitudes slain, and the land for its productions destroyed. The woman refuses to return home. Ezra resumes his narration of the suffering and desolate condition of the land; Jerusalem is destroyed, the temple rifled of its holy things, the Levites gone into captivity, virgins are ravished, infants, youth, strong and weak, are all destroyed together; and everything is under the entire control of enemies who hate the Israelites.—The woman then vanishes with a loud sound, and a city is seen in the place where she stood.

Uriel now comes to explain the vision. The woman is Zion. The thirty years barrenness are the thirty years preceding the time of building the temple by Solomon. His offering of oblations designates the son which was born. The nourishing of this son was the inhabitation of Jerusalem. His sudden death means the ruin of the city. Other visions are to be presented, if Ezra will remain another day.'

Chap. xi. xii. 'In a dream Ezra sees a great eagle, with twelve wings and three heads. From her wings, expanded over all the earth, sprung other smaller wings opposite to them, of which there were eight. These all vanish, one after another, in various ways, until only one head is left. A lion then comes from the forest, and addresses to the eagle words of severe reproof and threats, because of her tyrannical reign. The eagle vanishes before him. The seer awakes fatigued and distressed with his dream. The angel appears in order to interpret it. The eagle is the fourth beast in Daniel's vision, i. e. the Roman empire. Twelve kings [the twelve Caesars] shall reign over it, the second of which shall have the longest reign [Augustus]. The eight secondary wings are kings of short duration in the Roman empire; [tributary and dependent kings over some of the provinces?] These perish at various times and in different ways. The lion is the Anointed

One, who will judge and condemn opposing enemies. He will liberate the people of God, and make them happy until the time of the judgment. Ezra is commanded to write down all this, and deposite it in a secret place, but secretly to communicate these matters to the wise. He is commanded to wait seven days more for other disclosures.

All the people now come to Ezra out of the city, and beseech him to return. He comforts them, and bids them wait a few days, and then he will return to them.

Chap. xiii. After seven days, a great wind arises on the sea, and Ezra beholds a man surrounded by an innumerable multitude of heavenly beings. At his voice all nature shudders. From the four winds of heaven a countless host assemble to make war upon him. This man [the Messiah] raises up a great mountain and takes his station upon it. His enemies are struck with terror; he breathes forth fire and consumes them. He now descends from the mountain, and is surrounded by a great multitude; some are joyful and some sad. Ezra asks for the interpretation of these things. The angel thus interprets: The man from the sea, is he who will liberate the creature, [i. e. he is the Messiah]. The fire from his mouth, indicates the destruction which is to take place at his coming. "*My Son* shall be revealed." The nations will assemble to make war; he shall take his stand on the mount Zion, which shall be raised up for the occasion. "*My Son*" shall reprove the nations for their iniquities, and shall destroy them. The peaceful multitude, gathered around him after this, *are the ten tribes carried away captive by Salmanasar*. He will prepare the way for their return, and those who are left of the chosen nation will be protected. Inasmuch as the man ascended from the depths of the sea; this shows that we cannot discern him or his, until the time of his coming. Ezra is required to wait yet three days more.

Chap. xiv. A voice then speaks to him, and declares itself to be the same which addressed Moses out of the burning bush. He is commanded to lay up in his mind all which he had seen or heard. The end approaches. The world's period is divided into twelve parts, [Ethiopic version reads *ten*, which is doubtless the correct reading], ten and one half of which have passed away. Ezra is commanded to reprove his people, to put his house in order, and to live in the strenuous performance of all his duty. The old age of the world will bring many evils with it. Ezra is commanded to procure many tablets and five scribes. He then goes to the people, admonishes them to live virtuously, and forbids them to seek him for forty days. After this he goes with his scribes into the field again, and there a voice commands him to drink from the chalice which is proffered to him. He drinks, and is filled with understanding and wisdom. He dictates, and the scribes write, during forty days. He is commanded to publish the books thus written; which (according to the Ethiopic and Arabic version) make ninety-four volumes.'

[Here both the Arabic and Ethiopic versions come to a close, each adding an epigraph. The epigraph of the Arabic version reckons the time of Ezra's death, and makes it A. M. 5025—a mere fancy work of some transcriber].

Chap. xv. xvi. These, which are not a part of the original work, continue the speech which God is said to have commenced in chap. xiv. The substance of them is *comminatory*. The world shall be filled with woe, because of its wickedness. God will vindicate the just, and repay vengeance to their oppressors and adversaries. The Arabians and Carmanians shall contend together. Many wars in the north and east will succeed. All the elements will be in commotion. Babylon will be attacked. Asia [Minor] the ally of Babylon will be smitten because of her persecutions. Egypt and Syria shall be joined with it. Every kind

of evil shall come upon these countries. The evils are particularized, and repeated at great length. God who created and governs all things, and brings about all events, is able to accomplish all which he threatens. Sinners are exhorted to cease from sin, specially from persecution; the elect of God have assurance that they will be safe and happy, while the wicked will be sent to devouring fire.' [Written altogether in the spirit of many of the Sibylline Oracles].

Thus ends this singular production. The writers who added the first two and the last two chapters to the ancient work, were not very expert. The matter and manner of these additions differ so widely from the original book, that he must be dim-sighted indeed who does not perceive it.

I have already remarked, (p. 77), that the first two chapters are from a Christian hand; probably from the hand of a *Gentile* Christian. The anti-Judaic tendency is very apparent. The reproaches against the ingratitude, perverseness, and rebellion of the Jews, are very severe. Threats of entire excision, and assurances of the reception of the Gentiles in the room of the Jews, are prominent features of the whole representation. The references to the New Testament are plain and undeniable; e. g. in 1: 30, "I have gathered you as a hen [gathereth] her chickens under her wings," comp. Matt. 23: 37. So also in 2: 11; "I will give to them [the favoured Gentiles] eternal habitations, which I have before prepared for them," comp. John 14: 2. Luke 16: 9; so 2: 12, "The tree of life shall be theirs," [lignum vitae = עֵץ הַחַיִּים], comp. Rev. 22: 2; also 2: 40, "Zion . . . shall enclose *candidatos tuos*," i. e. those who are arrayed in splendid white robes, comp. Rev. 6: 11. 7: 13, 14. Again in 2: 42, "I saw on mount Zion a great multitude which no one can number, praising God," etc., comp. Rev. 14: 1; so in 2: 18, 19, "twelve trees laden with various fruits" for the righteous, and as many fountains of milk and honey, comp. Rev. 22: 1, 2.

In connection with this last passage in 2: 19, the writer adds: "[I have prepared] seven immense mountains, having roses and lilies, in which I will fill thy sons with joy." In this last part the writer would seem to have had in his mind the book of Enoch, ch. xxiv, where seven mountains, covered with odoriferous trees, are presented as the place of future paradise; or perhaps both drew from some common source. When, or by whom, these chapters were added, we have at present no means of deciding. The *Christian* cast of them is undisguised; and they seem to have been prefixed in order to prepare the way for the profitable perusal of the older work which follows.

The last two chapters (xv. xvi.) are of a less specific character, and must probably have come from a different hand. They are filled with general denunciations against the nations of the earth, and are severely comminatory, altogether, as has already been remarked, in the strain of much that is found in the so-called Sibylline Oracles. The references

to New Testament views are, in some places, sufficiently plain; e. g. 16: 29 compared with Matt. 24: 40, 41; 16: 42—45, compared with 1 Cor. 7: 29—31; 15: 8, 9 compared with Rev. 6: 9, 10. Indeed the whole piece is a designed, although humble and unsuccessful, imitation of Matt. xxiv, as Lücke has remarked, Einl. p. 99. The whole tenor of this after-piece seems to indicate, that when it was written, there were internal commotions in the Roman empire, and that foreign nations were assailing it with violence. Lücke places it somewhere between A. D. 250 and 300. In the absence of all satisfactory diagnostics of time, this conjecture may be allowed.

The ancient and main body of the work (ch. iii—xiv.) constitutes a whole by itself. Its main object is plain and simple; and this is, to comfort the people of God, i. e. the Jews, in their state of depression, persecution, and exile, with the hope of future deliverance. So far there is a resemblance to the Apocalypse; although I do not perceive any satisfactory evidence that the writer of this ancient work was acquainted with the Apocalypse. All the action of the piece is managed by the intervention of visions, dreams, and angel-interpreters; and in this respect, the ancient part of the book differs entirely from that of the first two and last two chapters, which employ no means of such a nature.

The writer's impatience of spirit, under the pressure of calamities which had come upon his nation and himself, is, from first to last, a prominent feature in the representation. The great problem is: How can the more wicked heathen remain not only unpunished, but even lord it over God's heritage, while that heritage is subjected to every kind of ignominy and vexation in a state of exile and oppression? Ezra is so disquieted at this, that he not only urges a solution of the difficulty, but from beginning to end dwells upon the same theme, and repeats the same questions; so that, as Lücke has well observed, it needed an angel's patience to bear with his questions.

The general costume is a designed imitation of the books of Daniel and Zechariah. But the matter is of such a nature as renders the question a little difficult, after all, whether the writer was a Jew or a Christian. On the one side it is evident, that *Jewish* sympathies originated the whole plan of the work. Indignation against foreign nations, the oppressors of the Jews, and contempt and hatred of them, are everywhere visible. The fable of Behemoth and Leviathan (6: 49 seq.) shows at least a familiarity with Jewish conceits. In 13: 39, 40, the Messiah is represented as collecting and bringing out of exile the ten tribes in Assyria. Everywhere an anxiety is shown, to satisfy the Jews that their present sufferings are to be attributed partly to their sins, and partly to the character of the times, which are the old age, or the iron age, of the world; and that patient endurance will at last bring them out of their sad condition.

On the other hand, in 7: 28, as the text now stands, it is said: "My Son Jesus, with those who are with him, shall be revealed, etc.;" and again in 7: 29, "After those [400] years, my Son the Christ shall die, and all men who have breath." We cannot suppose that any mere Jew, after the commencement of the Christian era, would have written in this manner; and after this period the book was probably written, as we shall see in the sequel. But neither the Arabic nor Ethiopic versions have the word *Jesus*, but only *Messiah;* which might be taken by a Jew from Ps. ii. Besides, along with these seemingly *Christian* elements are intermingled clear *Jewish* ones at the same time. "Those who are with him," (in 7: 28), appears to refer to the common Jewish expectation, that the ancient prophets were to accompany the Messiah, whenever he should make his appearance. The fact that the Christ is to die after 400 years, and all other men with him, shows the Rabbinic conceit of two Messiahs, the Son of David and the Son of Joseph. The latter was represented by the Jews as mortal and perishable. As to the time during which the Messiah's development would be made, it was stated very differently by different writers, even among the ancient Rabbins. The Tractatus Sanhedrin mentions seven different periods; the period of seventy years; of three generations; 365 years; 7000 years; so long as the world has lasted until the commencement of the Messianic reign; from the flood until the same period; and 400 years. The last period was vouched for by Rabbi Dusa, who says, that in Ps. xc. it is written: "Make us glad, according to the days in which we have been afflicted"; which, he adds, was 400 years [in Egypt], Gen. 15; 13.

At any rate such views of the Messianic period are not *Christian;* for the Christians always represented a thousand years as the period of the Messianic reign. Nor is the death of the Messiah, with that of all men, just before the day of glory and the final judgment (see ch. 7: 29—35), at all consonant with early Christian views. We are compelled then, by the essential elements in general of the work before us, to ascribe it to a *Jewish* origin; and the special Christology of it, if there be such, to an interpolating hand, such an one as added chap. i. ii. xv. xvi. to the body of the work.

In that portion of the book which is added by the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, after 7: 35, the question is strongly urged upon the angel by Ezra: Whether souls after death enter immediately upon their final destiny? The reply is affirmative; with the exception, that they are permitted to wander over the universe for seven days after the death of the body. There seems also to be a hint, in 7: 51, of a separate abode of the righteous after death. Yet neither of these is so peculiarly either Jewish or Christian, that it can afford any good evidence of the particular religious views of the writer.

The vision of the woman in 9: 38—10: 60 reminds one, as Lücke has remarked, of Rev. 12: 1 seq. Yet the explanation given by the angel (10: 38 seq.) is very diverse from the matter of Rev. xii. Again, the lion (11: 37 seq.) has some resemblance to the representation of John in Rev. 5: 5; yet the chastisement inflicted by the lion [i. e. the Anointed One] is of so general a nature (12: 31—35), that nothing more than such Messianic views as a Jew might entertain, are necessarily to be brought into the account. Again, the Messiah appears in chap. xiii; but while he destroys all his enemies by the fiery breath of his mouth, and vindicates the cause of the just, still in 13: 40 the ten tribes are brought to view as peculiar objects of his favor and protection.

On the whole we cannot well doubt that the work under examination is of *Jewish* origin, and perhaps from a Jew belonging to the ten tribes, but somewhat interpolated by Christian hands. How much it has suffered in the way of interpolation and abscission, is plain enough from a comparison of the Latin, Arabic, and Ethiopic copies; the former of which differs widely indeed from the others; but the latter two also differ from each other in a great variety of places. The *uncanonical* character of the work has exposed it to be tampered with, even from very early times.

As to the time in which the book was written, there seems to be no satisfactory *external* evidence. It has been alleged, that Barnabas' Epistle, c. 12, quotes Ezra 5 : 5. The words of Barnabas are: *καὶ λέγει Κύριος, ὅταν ξύλον κλίθῃ καὶ ἀναστῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἵματα ῥάξῃ*; the words of Ezra are: *Et de ligno sanguis stillabit.* The resemblance is plain; but as to actual *quotation* it is quite uncertain; and equally uncertain is a supposed reference to Ez. 2: 16, in Clemens Rom. I. 50. Clement simply quotes Is. 26: 20. In the quotations from Ezra, found in Ambrose De Bono Mortis c. X. XI. Comm. in Luc. 2: 21; in Opus Imperf., in Matth. XX. Hom. 34; and in Jerome, advers. Vigilantium and Ep. ad Domn. et Rogat., no aid is afforded toward the solution of the question before us. Jerome speaks contemptuously of the book, and avers that only heretics read it; which, however, after what Clement of Alexandria has said of it, in Strom. III. 16, attributing it to *Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης*, must be understood with much qualification. Ambrose also manifests as high a regard for it as Clement of Alexandria; De Bono Mortis, cap. X. XI.

We must resort then to *internal* evidence. And here it is evident from the tone, manner, and costume of the book, that it was written after the period when Rabbinic conceits began to abound. The fable of Behemoth and Leviathan; the ninety-four books which Ezra wrote (14: 44); the predicted proximity of the Messianic reign (4: 42); all savour of a date subsequent to the birth of Christ. But in particular, the

vision in ch. 9: 38—10: 51, and the passage in ch. 3: 1, plainly and explicitly avow the ruinous condition of Jerusalem (10: 48), and show that the author must have lived after the destruction of that city by the Romans. The destruction of it by Nebuchadnezzar is fairly out of question, considering the other historical matter to which the book everywhere adverts.

I see nothing against the supposition, that the author has given the true date of his book, at the commencement of it in 3: 1. He says 'he was in Babylon [Rome] in the 30th year of the ruin of the city,' when the series of his visions commenced; consequently at the end of the first century. In 12: 13 seq., the angel, in explaining the vision of the eagle [the Roman empire] says, that '*twelve* kings shall reign in it; the second of which [Augustus] shall reign longer than any one of the twelve. And as to the number *twelve*, such a number would not probably be designated, if more or less than this number of Roman Emperors had already reigned. We seem, then, to have good ground here for the conclusion, that the book before us (which is plainly a continuous whole) was written at the close of the first century; and probably by some Jew then in exile.

Whiston, H. Dodwell, Basnage, Fabricius, Corrodi, Storr, Kaiser, and F. Lücke, suppose the book to have been written at the close of the first century, or in the beginning of the second. Semler and Vogel maintain that it was written *before* the Christian era; and so does Dr. Laurence,* in his edition of it translated from the Ethiopic Ms. at Oxford, 1820. 8vo. Hartwig, in his *Apologie*, p. 241, sets it down to A. D. 217.

The Messianic passages of the genuine book are not numerous. They may be found in 4: 30 seq. 6: 25 seq. 7: 26 seq. 12: 32 seq. 13: 26—37. Among these are probably some *Christian* glosses, which have crept into the text. Independently of these, I can perceive noth-

*Dr. Laurence, in order to make out the twelve kings, begins with the original first seven kings of Rome, and then adds five others who aimed at dominion. The *long reign* of the second is that of Numa Pompilius. The eight small wings (11: 11) he represents as persons aiming at supreme command, e. g. Sulpitius the tribune, Marius (major), Cinna, Marius (minor), Carbo, Sertorius, Lepidus, and Antony. The three heads (11: 29—31) are Sylla, Pompey, and Caesar. The learned author seems more confident than usual, in this reckoning. But it must be remembered, that he has given to the book an origin which precedes the Christian era; and such an exegesis seems expedient, in order to support this view. A. F. Gfroerer, in an edition of the fourth book of Ezra (Stutgard 1840), assigns with confidence the date of the book to A. D. 90, and applies, as I have done above, the twelve wings to the twelve emperors in succession after Julius Caesar. The eight smaller wings he applies to the eight princes and heads of parties in Judea; see. 165, Note.

ing which a Jew might not have written, during the first century of our era. I might except, perhaps, the fact that the tone of the Messianic representations is rather too remote for a mere Jew, from that which we should expect from the *carnal* Jews of that period. It is of a *spiritual* rather than of a temporal cast; although the latter accasionally appears. Yet all Jews, it may be, did not think or reason in the same manner in respect to this subject; and the experience which the Jewish nation had gone through, at the end of the first century, might well have sobered some of the worldly notions about the Messianic reign, which the Jews in general entertained.

The reader, who designs to study thoroughly the Apocalypse, may be assured that his time will not be lost in a diligent perusal of the fourth book of Ezra. The costume given by the spirit of the age to books of this nature; a considerable number of the idioms of the New Testament; the tone of feeling common among the Jews of the first century; and many other matters of no small interest to the interpreter and critic; are developed in this production, in such a way as tends much to familiarize any one with things of this nature. And this is an end, the attainment of which is worthy of strenuous effort.

[The reader will find the literature of the book, best of all, in Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraph. Tom. II. p. 174 seq.; also in Whiston's Apost. Consitutt.; Dodwell's Dissertt. Cyprianicae, IV.; Basnage Hist. de Juifs, VI. 2; Lee's Dissertt. theol., mathemat., physical, I. p. 13 seq.; Semler, theolog. Briefe, erste Saml. p. 194 seq.; Corrodi, Geschichte des Chiliasmus, I. § 7; Laurence, Book of Ezra translated, etc. 1820. 8vo.; Gfroerer's republication of this, Stutg. 1840; and Lücke, Einleit. in die Offenbarung Johannis, 1832. 8vo.]

(d) The Sibylline Oracles.

The time has been, when the question respecting the origin and genuineness of these Oracles excited great interest among the learned in Europe. Of late this interest appears to have greatly subsided; indeed it has almost become extinct, as to any practical purpose. Formerly the subject was much overrated; in the not unnatural course of things it has now come to be as much underrated.

In the meantime the diligent inquirer, who is solicitously seeking light, from whatever quarter it may come, which may aid him to understand the writings of the New Testament, will find himself well repaid for an attentive reading of the Sibylline Oracles. They are, to be sure, as they now lie before us, a heterogeneous mass of compositions. They are all, moreover, in the *form* of Greek verse; but they come from different hands, being made up by the contributions of heathen, Jewish, and Christian writers, and they belong to different ages. They contain some things which are doubtless older than the Christian era; some

which must have been composed during the first and second centuries; and some which must be assigned to a period after the close of the fourth century. They have been put together into one mass, by some person who lived subsequent to this period; who, in order to make out an appearance of *unity* or *connection*, has added here and there some passages for this purpose; which, however, may generally be separated from the original matter of the work, by the tenor of its composition and by its incongruity with the context.

The reader, who has had no opportunity for an acquaintance with this extraordinary book, which has now become rare through want of interest in the public mind, and consequently a lack of editors, will not be displeased with some account of it here, as it has a bearing on the great subject, to the discussion of which the present work is devoted.

The time has been, in very early ages of Christianity, when many leading Christian writers quoted such of the Sibylline oracles as were then extant, with almost as much frequency and assurance as they did the Scriptures themselves. Celsus, the great opposer of Christianity, (about A. D. 150), derides the Christians for the frequent use they make of them, and avers that they are plainly the productions, not of heathen writers, but of Christians who have assumed the name of the Sibyl in order to deceive. Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, all appeal to them as the work of heathen prophetesses; who, however, were inspired in like manner as the Hebrew prophets, according to their opinion. They supposed, that God had thus compelled even heathenism itself to bear testimony to the truth and importance of revelation.

In the mean time, not all of the Christian fathers appear to have been of the same opinion. Irenaeus, Cyprian, and others, do not appeal to the Sibylline Oracles at all. Origen, when he comes to those objections of Celsus which have respect to the Christian use of the Sibylline Oracles, treats them in such a way as to show that he does not think much of these Oracles. But in the fourth century again we find great stress laid upon them. Eusebius, Lactantius, and Augustine frequently quote them. Lactantius appears to have had almost a monomania respecting their importance; as he scarcely argues a single point without continually appealing to them. Eusebius and Augustine are more wary, inasmuch as they seem to feel the difficulty made by the assertion of the heathen, that they were interpolated, if not wholly composed, by Christians.

In times subsequent to the age of Eusebius and Lactantius, we find Jerome, Optatus, Palladius, Sozomen, Junilius, and others, occasionally appealing to the Sibylline Oracles. But in most cases, the fathers in general appealed to them only when arguing against the heathen in favour of

Christianity; not in proof of the doctrines of the Christian religion in general. Their view of them seems to have been, that they might be employed, to a very important purpose, in the way of *argumentum ad hominem*. Professing to be the productions of the heathen prophetesses, Christians were ready to say to the heathen: Listen to what your own diviners have declared! Even those fathers, however, who declined to rely on these Oracles, do not appear to have come out with any decided declarations against their genuineness or importance. They were not willing to reject aid in a good cause, let it come from what quarter it might. If the whole composition were a fictitious matter, still they deemed it as having a tendency to confirm that which was true and good.

During the middle ages these Oracles went almost into desuetude; yet more from neglect than opposition. It was not until sometime after the Reformation, that they were brought into special notice, and made, at last, the theme of animated discussion. Betuleius, Castalio, Opsopäus, Casaubon, Scaliger, J. Capell, Blondell, Manesius, Hornbeck, H. Dodwell, G. J. Vossius, Cotelerius, J. Marck, E. Schmidt, Crasset, Nehring, Whiston, Beveridge, J. Vossius, Grotius, J. Reiske, Simon, Du Pin, Tentzel, Daubuz, Gallaeus, Ekhard, and others, engaged more or less in this discussion, and on different sides of it, some defending the genuineness of the books in question, and others assailing it and labouring to destroy their credit.

Recently Prof. B. Thorlacius of Copenhagen has, after another long cessation of interest in the subject, endeavoured to recall the attention of the learned to the ancient work before us. In a Latin volume, published in 1815 (Hafn. 8vo. pp. 172), he has subjected them to a more searching operation of criticism than any which they had before received. Yet still his undertaking was left in an unfinished state. In 1819 Prof. Bleek, then a young student at Berlin, published an examination of Thorlacius, and of the Sibylline Oracles themselves, which seems in general to have satisfied the learned in regard to the subject. This may be found in the Theologische Zeitschrift of Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Lücke, Heft. I. II. I have been greatly assisted by it in my investigations of the work under consideration, and cheerfully express my acknowledgments to Prof. Bleek.

The work as heretofore published, consists of *eight* books. Recently A. Mai has discovered and published Lib. XI. XII. XIII. XIV. Books IX. X. remain as yet undiscovered, or at least unpublished; nor do we know whether there are more than fourteen books. All the lately discovered books bear evident marks, with a few exceptions, of late composition. To a late period, also, must be assigned the first two books, with the exception of the proem to the first, which consists of ninty-four

lines. Of this proem I shall say a word in the sequel. I begin now with the first book, as it stands in the usual Mss. of the Sibylline Oracles.

It commences with a description of the creation of the world by the supreme Being, modelled for the most part after the first chapter of Genesis. The creation and fall of man are related; and then the biblical history is loosely followed down to the period of the flood, and thence to the building of Babel. Here, in order to keep up some semblance of heathen origin, the writer introduces the four ages of Hesiod, and copies them in his description somewhat closely, with the exception that he divides Hesiod's third age into two, which, however, he does not distinguish from each other with any good degree of precision. His fifth race are the giants (נְפִילִים) who immediately preceded the flood. Noah was an exception to the general character of this race. He is warned to build an ark. He preaches to the people and warns them. Two of his sermons are given. He predicts that Phrygia will be the place where the new development of the human race will be made, after the destruction by the flood. But his hearers do not listen to him. The flood comes and destroys them all. At length the waters abate, and Noah lands on the top of Ararat in *Phrygia!* All which are in the ark go forth, and a new and golden age of men begins, the sixth in order from the beginning of the world.

Here the Sibyl, who feigns herself to be a daughter-in-law of Noah, congratulates herself on her escape. She predicts a future Messiah, after some intervening reigns. The men of the golden age, (the *sixth* if we reckon the whole, but only the *first* if we count from the flood), peacefully pass into Hades, where they live until the judgment; a race of Titans succeed, who undertake the building of Babel, that they may scale the heavens. These are destroyed; and from these the writer makes a leap down to the Messianic times, which he describes with evident reference to the Gospel-history. The miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ are brought into view; and finally the subjugation and dispersion of the Jews by the Romans.

Book II. is in some Mss. connected with Book I, and is evidently a continuation of it. It commences with fearful commination of the "seven hilled city." General distress and slaughter succeed, so that the human race become nearly extinct. Those who remain will be preserved and greatly blessed. A crown of glory will be held out to view, for all who will enter into the contest against sin, and obtain the victory over it; especially will the crown be given to martyrs.

Next follow ninety-three verses, taken almost verbatim from the *Νουθετικόν* of Pseudo-Phocylides, which are mere moral aphorisms or proverbs. They are an unquestionable interpolation, and are found only in the Cod. Reg. They are inserted by Gallaeus (whose edition I use), after v. 55 of Book II. The connection is interrupted by them, and it were better to omit them.

Verse 149 seq. the writer goes on to give an account of the disastrous times which will precede the final judgment, in which war, famine, pestilence, etc., will rage. The people of Israel will go to look up the ten tribes, and will perish. Elijah will come from heaven. Fiery flames will consume all things, heaven and earth and Hades. Then follows the summons of all souls to judgment, by the angels; the resurrection of the body; the judgment by the Eternal on his throne and Christ on his right hand; all will pass through the fires of the last day; the righteous to their purification, but the wicked to their final and eternal ruin and misery; [an idea that savours strongly of the doctrine of purgatory].

The Sibyl concludes by confession of sin, and earnest supplication that she may obtain mercy in that tremendous day.

That these two books constitute *one* composition, coming from the same hand, Bleek has rendered altogether probable. At the beginning of Book I. the Sibyl declares that she intends to touch *ὁππόσα πρὶν γέγονεν, πόσα τ' ἐστίν, ὁπόσσα τε μέλλει ἔσσεσθαι κόσμῳ*. This promise is performed only in case we suppose that Books I. II. belong to the same composition. That these books are of *late* composition, is clear from the fact, that no writer quotes them until the fifth century. The matter of them is such, that had Lactantius (for example) known anything of them, he would not have failed to quote them largely; especially in his book on eschatology, Instt. VII.

In the edition of Gallaeus, sixty-two verses are prefixed to Book III, which are foreign to the Oracles. (In like manner this editor has prefixed eighty-four verses, transcribed from Theophilus ad Autol., to Book I.) Of the sixty-two verses, thirty-five are monotheistic simply, and evidently are a mere abridgment of the eighty-four verses just mentioned, which bear the same character. The remaining twenty-seven verses, (from a different hand), predict the advent of the Messiah, the punishment of Rome when he again appears, and finally the last judgment.

Book III. 1—30, as printed in Gallaeus, contains a description of Belias [Beliar or Belial], who, with pretended miracles, will deceive many and lead them astray; after which comes the general judgment. Probably this constituted originally one and the same piece with the preceding twenty-seven lines; but some lines have evidently been interpolated. Bleek ascribes this part of the book to an Alexandrine Jew, who lived about 40 B. C.

Book III. 35—99 exhibits a most singular production, beginning with a mythic account of Babel, and ending with the fable of Saturn, Rhea, the Titans, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto. From a heathen hand it must have come; or else from one which designedly imitated the manner of the heathen. It seems to be the oldest piece in the whole work; and a part of it (the commencement) is quoted by Josephus, and also by Alexander Polyhistor (about 140 B. C.); so that it must be nearly 200 years older than the Christian era. The reception of this into the Sibylline Oracles, wears the appearance of having been made with design to establish their pretences to a heathen origin.

Book III. 100—133 contains a brief sketch of the Jewish empire under Solomon; then of the Greek domination, then of the Macedonian; and lastly of the Roman, which is to end with the seventh king of Egypt who is of Greek origin. This must have been written by some Jew, at least some twenty or thirty years, perhaps more, before the Christian era.—Verse 134 begins a new strain. The writer designs to predict evils earlier and later. After comminations against various nations, he comes to the Jews. He relates the striking incidents of their history, from their origin in Ur down to the Babylonish exile and the re-building of the temple.—After this, with verse 233 commences a new strain of comminations. Babylon is severely threatened because it had burned the house of God. Egypt also will be destroyed; and here the writer seems to allude plainly to the

civil wars between Ptolemy Philometor and his brother Physcon, about 170—160 B. C. The land of Gog and Magog is next threatened; which is placed in *Ethiopia*. Then follows Libyia and the regions of the West, which "have helped to lay waste the house of God." This last declaration seems to allude to the *Romans;* and if so, it must be an interpolation, as the piece is evidently of a date anterior to the Christian era, and from the hand of a Jew.—Verses 272—318 exhibit another and somewhat different strain, although comminatory. Many towns of Asia and Europe are named, which will be destroyed; in which the author makes several mistakes in his geography. Rome is also severely threatened, and several of the Grecian islands. Then will succeed a prosperous and happy era, both for Asia and Europe. The earth shall produce abundantly, and all the virtues shall be predominant.—This is probably a mixed piece, extracted from different writers before and after the Christian era. There is some good reason for this conclusion, because vs. 289—318 wear the appearance of having come from a *Christian* hand, from one who had felt the bitterness of Romish persecution and sighed for deliverance.

The rest of this book, excepting merely twenty lines at the close, consists of a series of pieces, loosely joined together by some connecting links, which are filled with commination against almost all countries, but especially those belonging to the empire of Rome, Greece, and Egypt—all of which, in their turn, more or less oppressed and vexed the Jews who lived in Palestine or in Egypt. Bleek thinks that they must have been written by some Alexandrine Jew during the time of the Maccabees, i e. somewhere about 170—160 B. C. I find only now and then a passage which would seem to contradict this view; and such passages may in all probability be ascribed to some interpolating Christian hand of a later period; for such an one must doubtless have added the last twenty lines of the book. On the other hand, excepting the passages adverted to, everything seems to be viewed and described with the feelings of a Jew, probably an *Egyptian* Jew, who occasionally resents the wrongs done by the Romans and others to Egypt.

To him who reads this book for the purpose of New Testament criticism, those parts of it will have a special interest which relate to the expected Messianic age. Frequently does the writer recur to this theme, at the close of the different pieces which compose the book. Always is the period, as described by him, preceded by wars and tumults and distresses of various kinds. When these come to an end, the writer expects the "Prince of peace" to come and fill the earth with blessings. The reader may find, in the proem to Book III, a passage of this nature on p. 325 seq. (in the edition of Gallaeus who has not numbered the *lines*), where it is said: "The holy king of all the earth shall come, who shall wield the sceptre during all the ages of swiftly moving time." On p. 408 seq. is another Messianic passage, which, however, is probably from a later and a Christian hand: 'The prince of peace is to come; all Asia and Europe to be happy; all vices, hatred, injustice, wars, etc. are to be done away, and every kind of evil.' On p. 447 seq. is another long Messianic passage probably from a Jew; and so the sequel. After the wars of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Romans are described, the writer again recurs to the Messianic period, p. 460 seq., in which "the

people of the great God" [the Jews] shall be enriched with every blessing. After they have been again attacked by enemies, God will vindicate their cause again, destroy all their enemies, and introduce "the reign of peace," p. 465 seq. Here the description of the happy time which is to follow, is a protracted one; and it is closed by a reference to the passage in Ezek. 39: 9 seq., where the armour of Gog and Magog is to serve for a long time the purposes of fuel for all the inhabitants of the land.

After exhortations and counsel once more addressed to the enemies of God and of his people, the writer, (probably, as before, an Alexandrian Jew about 170—160 B. C.), relapses into his Messianic strain. I had transcribed, and would fain give a specimen of his manner, (which would also serve as an example of the manner in which the Jews of his time thought and wrote respecting the Messianic period), for the gratification of the reader who may not be able to procure or consult the book itself. But my limits forbid. I can merely refer to a passage which is somewhat above the ordinary level, beginning (in the edition of Gallaeus) on p. 473, *Ὁππότε καὶ τοῦτο, κ. τ. λ.*, comprising vs. 686—746. A part of this, however, I have translated as literally as I could, and will subjoin it in a note below, that the reader, who has not the book in question, may be enabled to see for himself the tenor of its composition.*

---

* "And when this shall come to an end [viz. the things related in the preceding context], the day of the Almighty, decreed in the beginning, shall come upon good men. The productive earth shall yield its boundless store of best fruit for mortals, of wheat, wine, and oil. Then [will he give] from above the delicious drink of sweet honey, and trees, and the fruit of fruit-trees, and fat sheep, and oxen, and the lambs of sheep, and the kids of goats; and he will make the sweet fountains to burst forth with white milk. The cities, moreover, shall be full of good things; and the fields shall be rich; there shall be no more sword on the earth, nor alarm of war, nor shall the earth any more with heavy groans be shaken. There shall be no war, nor drought upon the earth, nor famine, nor hail threatening the fruits. There shall, besides this, be great peace through all the world, and one king shall be the friend of another until the end of the age; and a common law for all the earth shall the Eternal in the starry heaven make perfect for men, as to whatever is done by bad men. For he only is God, and there is no other. He will also burn with fire the cruel rage of men.

Earnestly intent in your breasts upon my opinions, avoid sinful worship; serve the Living One; keep yourself from adultery and forbidden intercourse with males; nourish your own children, and do not destroy them. For the Eternal will be angry with those who commit such sins.

Then will he set up a perpetual kingdom over all men, when he gives his holy law to the pious; to all has he promised to open the earth, and the gates of the world of the blessed, every kind of joy; also perpetual wisdom, and endless gladness. From all the earth shall they bring frankincense and gifts to the house of the great God; nor shall there be any other house, where consultation shall be

The particular view which has been given of the third book, will serve to show the reader what the general strain and nature of the Sibylline oracles are; and moreover, it discloses what a real *misch-masch* they are, as they have come down to us, heathen, Jewish, and Christian authors being all thrust together into the same piece, and merely joined by some transition-verses which are from a later hand. These, however, are often so unskilfully composed, that they can scarcely serve to mislead even the uncritical reader.

Book IV. is plainly and undoubtedly from a *Christian* hand; and if we may judge from internal evidence, from some one who wrote soon after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

The Sibyl commences by declaring herself to be no prophetess of "lying Phoebus," but of the "great God, the creator of all things," whose universal empire she describes. Happy the men, she proceeds to say, who obey him; miserable will be all who practice the vices of the impious, especially false accusers and persecutors. [This seems to refer to the cruel persecutions of Nero.]

The past and present period of the world, beginning from the flood, is divided by the Sibyl into *eleven* ages; each of which is characterized by empires. To the Assyrian is assigned six; to the Median, two; to the Persian, one; to the Macedonian, one; and the eleventh falls of course to the Romans. During this the writer seems to have lived. War, pestilence, famine, earthquakes, etc., are, as usual, threatened to many countries; a famine of twenty years is assigned to Egypt. Destruction in Sicily, from the volcanic overflowing of Etna, is described at some length. The writer leaps hastily from one country to another, until he comes down to the dominion of the Romans, on which he dwells longer. He refers to the supposed flight of Nero into the East; for so the belief of the populace at Rome appears for a time to have been, at the period when Nero was secretly assassinated. Thus the Sibyl: "And then a king from Italy, energetic in action, dark in his designs, perfidious, shall fly beyond the river Euphrates, when he shall have committed the crime of the horrid murder of his mother, and many other [crimes], confiding in his malignant power." [This passage, and

made by men of a future age, but that which God has given to faithful men to reverence. [By another reading: "But they shall reverence the faithful man whom God has given; for mortals shall call him the Son of the great God;" which, no doubt, is a Christian interpolation, but so it stands in the Greek text of Gallaeus]. And all the paths of the field, and the rough shores, and the lofty mountains, and the raging waves of the ocean, shall be safely travelled over and sailed upon, in those days. The abundant peace of the good shall extend over the earth. The prophets of the great God shall take away the sword; for they shall be the judges and the just kings of mortals. Riches shall be lawfully acquired among men. The dominion and the judgment of the great God shall be the same, [i. e. both shall be universal]. . . . The wolves and the bears shall eat grass together on the mountains, and the leopards shall feed with the kids. The bears shall dwell in the same herd with the calves, and the carnivorous lion shall eat straw at the stall, like the ox, and children, the very babes, shall lead them in bands; even the maimed shall be a terror on earth to the beasts, and dragons shall repose by the side of infants, nor shall they harm them. The hand of God shall be over them, etc."

others of the like tenor, are supposed by most expositors, at present, to have an important bearing on the exegesis of Rev. 17: 10, 11]. The Romans shall come and lay waste "the broad fields of the Jews." The overflowing of Vesuvius under Titus (A. D. 79) appears to be next described; and then the punishment of the Romans, who shall experience the wrath of the God of heaven, because they have destroyed the guiltless race of the pious [Christians]. "Then shall also come the contest of excited war, and the great fugitive from Rome [Nero], brandishing his spear, and passing the Euphrates with many thousands of men." [This refers to the popular belief among early Christians, that Nero was to come from the East, as Antichrist, and conquer Rome, and again persecute Christians; a belief which seems to have taken its rise from 2 Thess. 2: 3 seq., respecting the *man of sin, the son of perdition.*]

Then follow several comminations against different places and countries; after these are fulfilled, great persecution is to arise; the writer exhorts to penitence and reformation, and concludes by giving assurance of the destruction of the earth, of the resurrection, and of the general judgment. After this is to come the millennial state upon earth. "Again the friends of piety shall live on the earth, God giving breath and life and support to all the pious. Most blessed the man, who shall live at such a time!"

Several of the declamations against various countries and places, wear the same appearance as the preceding heathen oracles of such a nature; and there is little room for doubt, that these were taken from heathen compositions, and incorporated by the writer with his own, in order to further the purposes of concealment.

Book V. This, like Book III. is made up of a great variety of compositions. Verses 1—51, are from the hand of a *Christian*, and probably a Christian Jew; for he gives a brief history of the Roman emperors, down to Adrian, following throughout the plan of designating them by *numerical* quantities which the first letters of their names respectively designate; and when he comes to Vespasian, he calls him *εὐσεβέων ὀλετήρ*, i. e. the destroyer of the pious. This seems to exhibit a strong Jewish sympathy.

There is nothing remarkable in this first piece, except that Nero, that "*δεινὸς ὄφις*, the matricide," is represented as returning after his supposed death, dividing the narrow isthmus-water [the Bosphorus], and setting himself up for a god, and thus coming to destruction; comp. 2 Thess. 2: 3 seq. The writer doubtless lived in the time of Trajan, whom he highly compliments, calling him *πανάριστε, πανέξοχε, κυανοχαίτα*. Probably the author lived in Egypt; as internal evidence shows. Verse 51, which refers to a later period, seems to be plainly an interpolation.

Verses 52—259 constitute a series of oracles, probably composed or digested by the same hand from which come the preceding verses. Verses 52—110 deplore the fate of Memphis and of idolatrous Egypt. In the sequel Nero is represented as laying waste Egypt and all the world, until a great king [the Messiah] appears, and overthrows all kings; after which comes the end of all things. Verses 111—178 are filled with comminations against Persia and the East, Asia Minor, and the Grecian islands. This part seems to be heathen oracles taken into connection with the writer's own composition. The latter part (verses 137—178)

relates to Nero, and repeats the usual story of his flying to the East, returning thence with great force, and laying waste the world. Finally Rome, "which has destroyed the faithful saints of the Hebrews and the true temple, shall be brought to utter desolation." [Here the *Jewish* Christian appears.] From the vivid manner in which the writer speaks of these things, it would seem that this piece must have been composed not long after the destruction of Jerusalem. Verses 129—246 contain comminatory declamations against a multitude of countries, and end again with the description of Nero's return and the evils which he will perpetrate. This is followed by a Messianic passage (verses 246—285), in which "the divine Jewish race" are represented as inhabiting a city in mid-earth [the centre of the world], which reaches even to Joppa. To this city Jesus, who was crucified, shall return, and address to its inhabitants words of consolation and peace. Verse 264 speaks of the Grecian empire over the East as ceasing; which seems to point to a time when at least that part of the piece now before us was composed. But if it was composed before the Christian era, as Bleek supposes, it has doubtless been interpolated. Verses 286—332 contain denunciations, as usual, against a multitude of cities, and refers to a number of those in Asia Minor as overthrown by earthquakes; [which happened about A. D. 19, according to Euseb. Chronicon]. It ends with praying for happiness to Judea, distinguished by blessings above all the earth. Probably, therefore, this was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Verses 333—341 denounce Thrace, the Hellespont, Egypt, and several towns in Asia Minor. They wear the appearance of heathen origin. Verses 342—385 denounce Italy in severe terms. The luminaries of heaven shall withdraw their splendour, and God will punish with unrelenting and awful severity, unless the worship of idols shall be forsaken, and himself alone adored. Here again comes in *the man of sin, the son of perdition.* "The matricide shall come from the ends of the earth [the regions beyond the Euphrates], the fugitive from notice, whetting his sharp teeth, who shall destroy all the land, have universal dominion, and devise everything with more cunning than all men. Her [Rome] by whom he was destroyed [alluding to his assassination] he shall speedily seize upon, and destroy many men, and princes of high rank. All shall he burn as he formerly did in another condition." [Whether the author means the burning of Rome, or of Christians, or both, it is difficult to decide; but the allusion is very significant.] The writer then goes on with his description of the extent and horrors of the war thus excited by Nero; all the elements join at last in the onset of battle, and contest will finally come to an end for want of victims. Then comes the reign of peace, which however is here but briefly hinted. Here the piece might end, and perhaps did once end; but the echo of it is kept up by inserting a piece which is probably from another hand; verses 386—433. Warning is given against all the vices prevalent at Rome. The perpetual fires of Vesta will be extinguished; [the temple of Vesta was burned when Nero set Rome on fire, A. D. 64]. "The long-beloved house was burned by thee [Rome], when I saw the second temple cast down headlong, wrapped in flames by an impious hand [that of Titus];—the house always flourishing, the temple dedicated to the service of God; the object of joy to the saints, evermore incorruptible, in soul and body the object of hope; neither will one inadvertently praise a god of contemptible earth, nor a stone has any skilful artificer fitted superior to those; the gold of the world, the lure of souls, is not worshipped; but the great God, the parent of all who draw the breath divinely imparted, do they honor with sacrifices and sacred hecatombs;" p. 623 seq. The writer proceeds to show how an *ἀφανὴς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἄναγνος*

[Titus], with a great army, cast down the temple, and ranged through the holy land; an unexpected σῆμα to mortals. Then comes "the man from the heavenly heights," [the Messiah], who restores all things, subdues all enemies, rebuilds "the city beloved of God," and makes it "more splendid than stars, or sun, or moon;" builds its tower so that it "reaches to the clouds;" and finally, makes it "δόξαν ἀΐδιον θεοῦ, a most desirable spectacle, the East and West celebrate the honour of God, nor shall evils any more come upon timid mortals." All vices shall cease. These are "the last times of the saints, introduced by God, who thunders on high, the maker of the greatest of all temples."

Such are the interesting themes of verses 386—433. One scarcely knows whether he should regard the author as a Jew or a Christian. A Jewish Christian, with strong sympathies for his land, capital, and worship, might have written the whole; but there is nothing here which a Jew might not have written, who merely cherished strong Messianic hopes as to the future. The colouring seems on the whole, however, to be more of the Jewish than of the Christian hue. I must therefore suppose, that a Jew, not long after the destruction of Jerusalem, wrote the piece before us. It is full of instruction as to the views, feelings, hopes, and expectations of the Jews, at the period in which it was written; and in particular does it cast light on the popular expectations respecting *Nero;* which is an important circumstance, as we shall hereafter see. Bleek thinks the whole might have been written by a Christian, and that it may be allegorically interpreted as having respect to the christian church; although, on the whole, he rather inclines to a different exegesis. It does not seem to me, that the allegorical interpretation is here allowable. I must believe the piece to have been written not long after the death of Nero, when the expectation of his reappearance was strong and general among the populace.

Verses 434—483 inveigh against Babylon, and many other places. Famine, inundations, earthquakes, etc., are threatened to Asia and Europe. When, or by whom, it was written, there is no satisfactory internal evidence. Verses 484—551 are threatenings directed against Egypt. Her gods shall perish. The priests themselves will demand that the great God shall be worshipped, his honours be restored, and his temple built. The Ethiopians shall invade the land, and destroy the temple; and then all the powers of heaven and all the stars shall contend against them, precipitate themselves on the earth and burn it up; so that the heavens shall become ἀναστέρος. Thus ends the book.

This last piece appears plainly to be from the hand of an Egyptian Jew; who seems to allude to the Jewish temple built at Leontopolis about 150 B. C., and who probably wrote when this was, or was about to be, destroyed. Nearer than this we cannot come to his age.

Book VI. This contains only twenty-eight verses; and these are a hymn to the Son of God, although it is clothed in a prophetic garb. Lactantius quotes it; but no Christian writer before him; so that it

was probably written some time during the latter part of the third century, or early in the fourth, by some Christian.

The writer celebrates the "*μέγαν υἱόν*, to whom the Most High has given a throne." His baptism, the descent of the Spirit as a dove, his office as teacher, his miracles, are alluded to; then follows a description of his universal dominion, and of the peaceful state of the earth. Denunciation against the land of Sodom [Judea, see Is. 1: 10] follows, which crowned the son of God with thorns, and gave him gall to drink. "O most blessed cross!" the writer exclaims, "on which *θεός* was suspended. The earth shall not contain thee [*θεόν*], but thou shalt see the heavenly temple, where the renewed and brightened face of the Godhead shall shine."

Book VII. Lactantius has quoted verse 122 of this book (Instt. VII. 16); but besides this, we find no other quotations among the ancient Christian writers. The book, as to most of its contents, is in all probability from one and the same hand. Its author seems to have been a Christian Jew, living some time during the latter half of the third century. It is evidently full of interpolations; and it also exhibits strong evidence of having suffered excisions or defalcations. E. g. the very first verse begins with *Ἔσση δὲ πρώτη πόλεων*; which of course indicates that there was once some preceding context. Verses 65—94 contain a hymn of a Gnostic character, which was probably added, by a later hand, to the original composition.

Denunciation is, as usual, the order of the day. Delos, Sicily, Cyprus, Phrygia, Ethiopia, Egypt, and Laodicea, are threatened with destruction in different ways. Verses 23—34 contains a Messianic passage, which is obscure, and probably an interpolation. It introduces the *γεννηθεὶς ὁ μέγας θεός*, as creating the stars; he will be king of all, and king of peace; "all shall be completed by the Davidic house; God has given him the throne, and angels sleep at his feet," even those who preside over fire, water, cities, and winds. The denunciatory strain is now continued, after a dark passage (verses 35—49) out of which I can make no tolerable sense. Ilium, Colophon, Thessalia, Corinth, Tyre, and Coele-Syria, are all threatened. Then follows the Gnostico-Christological hymn, verses 65—94, the matter of which is very curious. "Unhappy," says the writer addressing some place or land (probably Judea), "who didst not know thy God, who was washed in the stream of Jordan, and on whom the Spirit lighted." "He was before the stars; was made prince by the word of the Father and by the pure Spirit. After his incarnation, he speedily left the earth to go to his Father's house. In heaven three towers are built for him, in which the *θεοῦ . . . μητέρες ἑπτάλαι* dwell." Then, after disclaiming ritual worship and sacrifices, the writer adds this singular passage: "Thou, with all thy relatives, shalt take wild fowl, and making supplication thou shalt send them forth; then directing thine eyes to heaven, and pouring water upon the pure fire, thrice shalt thou exclaim: Father, etc." The matter of the prayer is then given; but to me it is quite unintelligible, and, no doubt, it conceals the Gnostic *βάθη*. The piece ends with exhortations to practise the Christian virtues.

After this, the general strain of the *original* piece is resumed. Sardinia, Mygdonia, Celtiguae [Gauls], and finally Rome, Syria, and Thebes, are denounced.

Fire shall destroy the whole. Especially shall false prophets be punished, who feign themselves to be Hebrews. To a time of general destruction shall succeed the renovation of the earth, which shall spontaneously produce all that is needed, and God shall dwell with men and teach them.

The remainder of the book (verses 145—156) contains a confession of many aggravated sins on the part of the Sibyl, even that of incest. It seems plainly to be a mere imitation of the end of Book II., and therefore must have been written after the end of the fourth century. It is doubtless an interpolation here; and a miserable one too, for it places the Sibyl below the common order of prostitutes. The object however is, to show that the piece is of *heat en* origin.

Book VIII. This consists probably of many different pieces, but so loosely and unskilfully put together, that it is very difficult, as Bleek intimates, to decide whether it has one or twenty authors.

It commences with the declaration, that the Sibyl is going to disclose the wrath of God against the whole world. All things shall be burned up. Avarice is the great sin that occasions all evils; it would exclude the poor from the world if it could. Rome shall first fall. After *thrice five* kings Adrian shall succeed, who will deify a boy [Antinous]. After him shall reign three, who live in the last times." [The writer doubtless means Antoninus Pius, and his two sons Marcus and Lucius Verus.] The kings heap up riches, which "the matricide fugitive, coming from the ends of the earth, will distribute to all, and make Asia very rich." Nothing shall stand before him. Then the end of all things shall come and the judgment of God. Rome shall be plunged into a lake of fire and brimstone, and her wailings be heard by all. Then follows a picture of her miseries, seemingly intended to resemble the wailings over Babylon in Rev. xviii. Verses 131—160 consist of one or more pieces relating to the same subject, viz., the fall of Rome, and the victorious return and cruel excesses of Nero. "No longer shalt thou," [queen of cities], says the Sibyl, "have empire over the fields of fruitful Rome, when the ruler shall come from Asia with Mars. When this is done he shall come with violence against the city" [Rome], verses 145—147. Again: "From the Asiatic country shall he come in Trojan chariots, with vehement indignation. Surveying all, he marches on, passing over the sea [the Hellespont]; and then black blood shall accompany the great beast. The dog has produced a lion, which will destroy the shepherds. [Q. Nero, at first only a *κυών*, has now become a *λέων*?] But they shall take away his sceptre, and he shall go down to Hades." [Comp. Rev. 17: 8, 11.] This whole piece wears the air of being composed earlier than the preceding part of the book, which (verse 50 seq.) refers to *thrice five* kings of Rome, and particularly to Adrian, then again (65) to Antoninus Pius and his two sons, Marcus and Lucius Verus. The *πορθήσων . . . Ἑβραίων ἔθνος* of verses 140, 141 must be either Titus or Adrian; I should incline to the former, because the predictions respecting Nero's return seem to be of such a character as must have been current soon after his death. Verse 148 speaks of 948 years [i. e. A. U. C. = A. D. 194], as the time of Rome's duration. But this verse appears to me to be adscititious, being later than the surrounding context. Verses 160—168 denounce Rhodes, Thebes, Rome, Delos, Samos, and Persia, in the usual style. To this succeed two verses which seem to be Messianic: "Then shall a pure king reign over all the earth forever, raising the dead." Verses 171—215 are a singular, and (to me in many places) unintelligible mixture. Whose is the *θηλυτέρης . . . μέγα κράτος . . . ὅταν βασιλήϊδα τιμὴν στεψαμένη τύχῃ*

I wot not, unless it be the church under the symbol of a woman. A millennial season is described as following this *κράτος*, after the resurrection from the dead.

Next follow thirty-four lines, which constitute an *acrostic* with the name *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς* [sic!] *θεοῦ υἱός, σωτήρ, σταυρός*. The matter of them has respect to the final judgment and destruction of the world, the punishment of the wicked and the joys of the pious. Lactantius has cited some of these verses; but he intimates nothing respecting the *acrostic* in them. There can scarcely be a doubt, therefore, that this part was composed after his time, by selecting here and there a verse, altering some, and composing others. The piece has very little close connection; as we may well suppose.

Next follows a kind of historical account of the incarnation, miracles, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, with continual allusion to facts related in the Gospels. Zion is called on to rejoice in her king, and to acknowledge *αὐτόν σου θεόν, θεοῦ υἱὸν ἔοντα*. Spiritual worship must she pay him.—After this all things shall be destroyed; and the particulars are given with an unusual degree of poetic spirit. God has revealed all his secrets to the Sibyl, (so she proceeds), and she understands the nature and times of all things. She then extols the divine unity, and denounces idolatry inveighing against its follies and its rites at length. The moral virtues are next commended, and the rewards and punishments of the judgment day propounded. With v. 429 a new strain seems to begin, which must be assigned to quite a late period. The sovereign and creative power of God is first celebrated. Then the incarnation of the Logos follows with the annunciation of Gabriel, the rejoicing of heaven and earth at his birth, the visit and homage of the Magi and of the shepherds. Christians must offer pure and spiritual worship to God, and never join in any of the rites of idols. In this piece, v. 463 gives to the virgin Mary the appellation of *ἡ αἰεὶ κούρη*; which shows that it probably was not composed until after the fourth century; for it was after that period when the subject of Mary's perpetual virginity began to be discussed. Thus ends the eight books, which have, until recently, comprised all that was known in modern times respecting the Sibylline Oracles.

Since the publication of Bleek's critical examination of the eight books of the Sibylline Oracles, A. Mai, in his Nova Collectio Scriptt. Vet. III. p. 202 seq., has published Books XI—XIV, which he found in the Libraries of Italy; so that only Books IX. X. are now wanting, in order to complete fourteen books of this most singular relic of antiquity. As I have not been able to procure a copy of this work of Mai, and therefore have had no opportunity to examine the remaining books of the work before us, I shall here subjoin, in a note, a brief account of the books recently discovered, as given by F. Lücke in his Introduction to the Apocalypse, p. 122 seq.*

* "The dryness and uniformity of tone, in a word, the whole manner of these books, is the same as in the first eight. The religious and doctrinal elements, however, are much less apparent. Book XI. contains a Sibylline representation of Jewish, Grecian, Macedonian, Romish, and Egyptian history, from the flood down to Julius Caesar. The tone is apparently Jewish. It resembles, in particular, that of Book III; and in part it exhibits the same expressions and verses; e. g. v. 161 seq. respecting Homer, comp. Book III. v. 357 seq.; v. 200 seq. respecting Alexander the Great, comp. Book III. v. 319 seq. As a whole, how-

I do not learn that any special aid is to be derived from these additional books, to the purposes of New Testament criticism and exegesis. Bleek, it seems, has not deemed them to be of sufficient importance to continue his Sibylline criticisms; which he promised to do, in case there should appear to be sufficient reason, when these latter books were published.

A hasty or superficial reader may judge the time and pains bestowed on such books as these, to be but illy laid out. I can assure him that he is much in the wrong, and that the study of them helps to place one in the ancient circle of thought, reasoning, and expression, among both Jews and Christians, to which, in case he means to pursue critical studies, it is of no small importance for him to attain. The Sibylline Oracles, so far as I can judge, do not contain more than one or two seemingly designed imitations of the Apocalypse. Book VIII. v. 104 seq. contains a lament over Rome, evidently, as I think, designed to imitate Rev. xviii. But in all the Messianic passages, and in all the millennial ones, although there are of course many points of coincidence with the Apocalypse, yet there does not seem to be any, or scarcely any, de-

---

ever, the character of the composition is somewhat different, sometimes more compressed, at other times more diffuse; in general the connection is more close. In all probability it is a Jewish Alexandrine production, and of a date a little before the Christian era. Or is it merely an imitation of such a production?"

"Book XII, in its commencement, resembles the beginning of Book V. It holds the same course. The series of Roman emperors, from Augustus downwards, is described in the Sibylline manner; but under Augustus the appearance of the Saviour is made the subject of special notice; which is not the case in Book III. While in Book III. the account is brought down only to Adrian, in Book XII. it is continued down to Alexander Severus, to whom it leaps from Septimius Severus, [omitting Caracalla and Heliogabalus]. It is much mutilated at the close; yet it is clear that it stops with Alexander Severus. Perhaps, in accordance with the probable meaning of v. 287, which is somewhat obscure, it was written in the year 222, after the death of Alexander Severus."

"Book XIII. narrates, in a Sibylline manner, the wars, especially the oriental wars, of the Romish empire, down to Valerian and Gallienus in the middle of the third century. But with what emperor the narration commences, I am not able to conjecture; perhaps with the time succeeding Alex. Severus. The central point appears to be Egypt. The account of the mathematical fame of Bostra [in Phenicia] v. 67 seq., is a remarkable circumstance."

"Book XIV. is obscure. The destruction of Rome, however, is a prominent feature of it, v. 31 seq.; then follows the rebuilding of the same, v. 125 seq. The circumstance is noted, that Rome furnishes itself with provisions for one whole year, in expectation of a long season of distress. The last of the Latin race of emperors appears and passes away; but after him comes a race of kings who continue a long time. The irruption of the northern hordes, and the fall of the western Roman empire, stand prominent everywhere. The whole may probably have been composed in the fifth century."

pendence of the one composition on the other. A coincidence, then, as to matter or manner between the two writings, affords us, under such circumstances, the more satisfactory testimony as to the modes of thinking and speaking on Messianic subjects, during the early ages of Christianity. More or less of illustration by means of the Sibylline Oracles, in regard to difficult passages in the Apocalypse, or in respect to those whose aesthetical character has been severely questioned, the reader will find in the sequel of the present work.

There are moreover so many passages, in these Oracles, of a *millennial* character; so many that describe the wrongs and sufferings of those who were persecuted on account of their religion; so many that threaten destruction and ample retribution to heathen and cruel Rome; so many that have regard to the beast, the man of sin and the son of perdition [Nero]; so many that bring to view the future prosperity and glory of the church; that every judicious reader must perceive at once, how near the prominent and principal subjects of these books come to the all pervading subjects of the Apocalypse. How can it be, that the one should not cast some light upon the matter and manner of the other?

As a specimen now of what may be gathered from such a book as this, to illustrate some peculiarities in the style of the Apocalypse, let us turn our attention to Rev. 13: 18, where the name of the beast, which symbolizes Rome, is said to designate the number 666, and to be *ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου*, i. e. reckoned after the usual mode among men of counting numbers. This has been put by some to the account of *Cabbalism*, in the writer of the Apocalypse; or it has even been regarded by others as only a kind of childish trifling with so grave a subject. But that such modes of designating names, which were not intended to be spoken out directly and yet were designed to be made known to the reader, were common in ancient times, appears plainly from the Sibylline Oracles. E. g. in Book I. v. 141 seq. (p. 115), Jehovah, in addressing Noah, is represented, instead of declaring his own name directly, as propounding it in the following terms:

Ἐννέα γράμματ' ἔχω, τετρασύλλαβός εἰμι, νόει με·
Αἱ τρεῖς αἱ πρῶται δύο γράμματ' ἔχουσιν ἑκάστη,
Ἡ λοιπὴ δὲ λοιπά, καὶ εἰσὶν ἄφωνα τὰ πέντε.
Τοῦ παντὸς δ' ἀριθμοῦ ἑκατοντάδες εἰσὶ δὶς ὀκτώ,
Καὶ τρεῖς τρὶς δεκάδες σὺν γ' ἑπτά.

That is: "I have nine letters, and am of four syllables; consider me; [i. e. reflect well what name corresponds with this]. The first three [syllables] have each two letters; the remaining one the rest [of the letters]. Five of them are consonants. In respect to the whole number, it is twice 800, and three times three decades, with seven."

It does not appear from the context, after all, what the name is, and

different names have been conjectured. The word *ἀνέκφωνος* (*unspeakable*) seems to correspond best to the description. This word has five consonants; the first three syllables have each two letters; the number amounts indeed only to 1696; but with the addition of a *μονάς*, i. e. unity or one, the *περιεκτικὸς, ἀποκαταστατικὸς, καὶ προσλάμβανος ἀριθμός*, i. e. the comprehensive, restorative, and helping number, (as the Platonists and Pythagoreans call it), makes out the number in question. The whole agrees entirely with the ancient notion, that the name of Jehovah was *ἀφώνητος*, (as Josephus says), and was known only to the high-priest of the Jews. *Ἀνέκφωνος* is not indeed a common Greek word; but it is formed analogically, and corresponds so well, both in respect to number and signification, with the intention of the Sibyllist, that it does not seem to be improbable that this word was intended. So Gallaeus, in a note upon the passage.

Again, in vs. 325 seq. (p. 177), the Sibyllist, having concluded the account of the flood, and the return of its waters, predicts the coming of the Messiah: "Then the Son of the great God, clothed in flesh, shall come to men, being made like to mortal men on the earth:

Τέσσαρα φωνήεντα φέρων, τάδ' ἄφωνα ἐν αὐτῷ
Δισσόντ' ἀγγέλλων, ἀριθμὸν δ' ὅλον ἐξονομήνω.
Ὀκτὼ γὰρ μονάδας, τόσσας δεκάδας ἐπὶ τούτοις
Ἠδ' ἑκατοντάδας ὀκτώ, ἀπιστοκόροις ἀνθρώποις
Οὔνομα δηλώσει."

That is: "Producing four vowels, and announcing doubly the consonants, the whole number I will recount. His name shall designate to unbelieving men eight monads [unities], so many decades added to these, and also 800." In other words: The name *Ἰησοῦς* has four vowels, and one consonant which is doubled. In reckoning these, $\iota = 10$, $\eta = 8$, $\sigma = 200$, $o = 70$, $\upsilon = 400$, $\varsigma = 200$; the whole sum $= 888$. How much this resembles the 666 of Rev. 13: 18, is too plain to be insisted on.*

In Book V. vs. 11 seq., the succession of Roman emperors down to Adrian is marked, by referring to the numerical value of the first letter in one of their leading names; e. g. "he whose name signifies *twice ten* stands at the head of the series," meaning *Καῖσαρ*, or Julius Caesar, where $K = 20$. "Next follows he whose name is the *first* of the alphabet," i. e. Augustus; "then he whose name marks 300," i. e. Tiberius; "then he whose name marks 3," i. e. *Γαῖος*, i. e. Caius Caligula; then $K =$

* The second clause, viz. *τάδ' ἄφωνα ἐν αὐτῷ, Δισσόντ' ἀγγέλλων*, is a text which I have formed from that of the Cod. Reg. and Puteanus. The common text, *τάδ' ἀφωνα ὃν αὐτῶ δισσῶν ἀγγέλων*, is plainly corrupt, and yields no intelligible meaning. The text as I have proposed it, makes some appropriate meaning possible.

30, i. e. *Κλαύδιος*, Claudius; next $N = 50$, i. e. *Νήρων*, Nero; then Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are not specifically named, but adverted to as destroying each other; next comes *Οὐεσπασίανος*, $o = 70$; then *Τίτος*, $\tau = 300$; then *Δομιτίανος*, $\delta = 4$; Nerva, $\nu = 50$; Trajan, $\tau = 300$; then Adrian, "who has the name of a sea" (the Adriatic). In his reign the writer in all probability lived; so that it could have been but a little while after the Apocalypse was written, when this mode of designation was employed.

Besides these, there is the *acrostic* piece, of which an account is given on p. 100 above.

Now as none of these reckonings appear to be grounded at all on the Apocalypse,* they serve, as independent testimony, to show what the taste of the early ages of Christianity was, when matters of this nature were to be designated in a *prophetic* way, and names were not intended to be plainly and directly spoken. If there be any conceit in this, John does not stand alone, at all events. I accede to the truth of the remark, that the taste of our times is different; but I am not aware, that in a matter of so delicate a nature as that with which John was concerned in the Apocalypse, i. e. in speaking of the Roman emperors under whose dominion he lived, he could well have managed this business with more caution and delicacy than he has done, provided that at the same time he felt bound (as he doubtless did) to declare the whole truth so that it might be understood. A heathen magistrate would be likely to read Rev. 13: 18 with scorn or with disregard; Christians would naturally seek with deep interest for the meaning of the writer, and might find it without much difficulty. See the Excursus on Rev. 13: 18, in Vol. II., for further explanations.

Those who fully believe that when God speaks to men, he does it in conformity with modes of thinking and speaking which belong to the age and country in which they live, will find, in such a mode of designating names as the Sibylline Oracles present, evidences of the probability that John might have employed a similar method of speaking, and have done so without giving any offence to the taste of his contempora-

* When I suggest, that none of the Sibylline Oracles appear to be grounded on the book of Revelation, I speak only what the reading of them everywhere has suggested to me, so far as the *style* and *manner* of the Apocalypse are concerned. That the same *doctrines*, in many respects, are taught in both, is fully conceded; for some of the Sibyllists have drawn largely from the store of Christian doctrine. But they do not present it in Apocalyptic colours. At least, I can see no attempt at close imitation. There can be no doubt that the Apocalypse was extant, when the above *numerical* descriptions were written; and especially the two copied from Book I., which is of later stamp. But still, there is no apparent attempt at imitation. It appears to be rather the spirit of the times, than imitation of Rev. 13: 18, which prompted the efforts of the authors.

ries. Above all may this be conceded to him, when the necessity for speaking in a guarded manner was much more urgent on him, than it was in any of the cases where such a method of designation is adopted in the Sibylline Oracles.

The reader may now perceive, by an example of such a nature as is produced above, how easy it is to suppose, that the Sibylline Oracles may be profitable reading for an interpreter of the Apocalypse.*

The facts stated in the note below, serve to show how widely spread were the original Sibylline Oracles, either real or pretended; and also how much credit was given to them at Rome, in preference to all other oracular compositions. Viewed in this light we can account for it, that the Jews of Egypt began early to imitate the Sibylline Oracles, in order that they might gain a listening ear among the heathen to the monotheistic doctrines inculcated by their compositions. To the heathen, who allowed the importance of Sibylline testimony, an appeal of this nature, it was thought, would prove to be an *argumentum ad hominem*. With what success this *pious fraud* was attended, we do not for certainty know. It would seem at least to have made considerable impression; otherwise it would hardly have been resorted to so often as it was.

* I subjoin in a note, a few historical notices, which may serve to cast some light on the rise of such a book as the *Sibylline Oracles*. Long before the Christian era, Oracles of the Sibyls were in circulation among the heathen. They appear to have had altogether the most credit among the Romans. The common account of the Roman historians is, that a Sibyl of Cumae came to Tarquin the second, and sold him *three* books of oracles, after destroying *six* which he had before twice refused to purchase; that he paid a large price for them, and committed the custody of them to two priests of the patrician order, [duumviri sacrorum]; that they were deposited in the Capitol at Rome, and consulted only on public occasions, and then with great solemnity; that in the civil war between Marius and Sylla they were burnt, together with the Capitol, (about 82 B. C.); and that after this, the Senate by a decree, caused search to be made throughout Italy and Greece for Sibylline writings, great numbers of which were procured. It seems highly probable, that many were forged, in these circumstances, in order to obtain money for them from the Roman Senate. Cicero (de Divinat. II. 54) openly attacks the credit of them; and Augustus, (B. C. 21), when he came to the office of the supreme Pontificate, after the death of the Consul, Lepidus, gave orders for the collection of all *Libri Fatidici* throughout the empire; in consequence of which more than 2000 of them were collected. These he burned; and also many of those deposited in the Capitol, which he judged to be worthless, (Sueton. Augustus, cap. 31). Tiberius also burned many more. The Roman (Christian) emperors forbade them to be taken from the temple of Apollo Capitolinus. There they were consulted, however, by the emperor Julian (A. D. 363), and in 399 they were burned by Stilico, agreeably to an order of the emperor Honorius.

Varro reckons no less than *ten* Sibyls, at his time; (he was cotemporary with Julius Caesar, and dedicated his *Libri Divinarum Rerum* to him). The number has been much disputed; Plato speaks of but one; Solinus and Pliny of three; Aelian of four; the account of Varro has been generally admitted in modern times.

From Jews before the Christian era, and Jewish Christians after the commencement of it, seems to have proceeded a large portion of the whole mass of Sibylline Oracles. The contents of them show, that none of them, as they now are, could have been the pure compositions of heathen writers; unquestionably none of them belonged to the collection of Sibylline writings at Rome; unless, possibly, a few paragraphs or lines, here and there, may have been inserted from copies of those Oracles which were extant before the expurgation by Augustus.

No wonder, now, that in an age when pious frauds were so common, and when Sibylline and other Oracles so abounded as they did in the time of Augustus, that here and there a proselytist, whose imagination was much more prominent than his judgment or integrity, should have resorted to such means of accomplishing his end. That cunning in this case, however, as in most others, defeated its own purposes, is plain enough from the manner in which Celsus treats the compositions before us. The whole fraud was evident enough to his sagacity; and he ridicules it and shows his contempt for it, in a manner that proves how ill-adapted pious frauds are, in the end, to promote the cause of truth and holiness.—I am aware, that some, e. g. Thorlacius, and several individuals before him, have defended the intentions of those who wrote the Sibylline Oracles, and have merely placed them to the account of honest and well-intended fictions. The study of them has satisfied me, that the writers intended they should be taken as the actual productions of heathen *Fatidicae*, in order that heathen readers might be silenced when Christian arguments were urged upon them, by an appeal to their own admitted authorities.

Be this however as it may, it alters not the value of the books to us, when searching for means of illustrating the productions of the first century. The Sibylline Oracles, specially those which were composed by Christians, exhibit the modes of thinking and speaking common at that period, in regard to many highly important subjects. No intelligent man can read them, who has an acquaintance with the criticism and exegesis of the New Testament books, without feeling that he is sensibly a gainer by the labour bestowed upon them. But how any one can now read them, and come to the conclusion that they were actual *revelations* of the Godhead to the heathen, which have merely been interpolated by Christians, I am not able to see. Yet Bishop Horseley did so; and in his posthumous Works is a defence of this position. Seldom have so much talent and learning as this prelate possessed, been united with so little critical taste, skill, and sound judgment. His predominant instinct seems to have been a love of paradoxes. Why should the Sibylline Oracles be viewed in a different light from that in which we place the great mass of apocryphal books, which have come down from the early

ages? Some of these are superior, in point of taste and importance of matter, to the Sibylline Oracles.

I am aware of what Thorlacius and others have said in praise of these compositions. That now and then a few verses occur, or a paragraph, which are well executed, and contain good doctrine, even noble sentiments, is certainly true. But the great mass of them is such dry, formal, tumid, inanimate, and pedestrian verse, that I cannot but subscribe to the judgment of Bleek, who thinks the book would seldom indeed be looked at, were it not that there is so much material in it for critics.

[The editions of these Oracles are, (1) Of Betuleius, 1545, 8vo. (2) The same with Castellio's Lat. version, 1546. (3) Opsopaeus, 1589, 1599, and 1607, 8vo. (4) Gallaeus, 1689, 4to. At the close of the last named edition, is a collection (from Opsopaeus) of the most notable of the heathen Oracles, which have been preserved in different authors of ancient times. The reading of these will satisfy any one, how different is the tenor of such compositions from that of the Sibylline Oracles which have just been examined. It is utterly vain to think of maintaining their genuineness.—The best account of these Oracles, is that by Bleek in Schleiermacher, etc., Zeitschrift, St. I. II. Thorlacius has published a *Critique* on them, in his Libri Sibyllistarum 1815, 8vo.; which, however, Bleek has nearly demolished.

If the reader wishes to pursue his investigations to a wider extent, he will find ample discussions by Casaubon, Scaliger, Capell, Manesius, Hornbeck, J. C. Vossius, Cotelerius, Marckius, Schmidt, Crasset, Nehring, Whiston, Beveridge, J. Vossius, Grotius, Simon, Du Pin, Reiske, Tentzel, Daubuz, Ekhard, Gallaeus, Heumann, Reinesius, Huet, Cave, Mosheim, Münscher, Corrodi (a vivid picture), and Fabricius. To these may be added Schoel, in his Geschichte Griech. Lit., I. p. 33 seq.; also Thorlacius' Conspectus Doctr. Christ, in Lib. Sib., in Miscellanea Hafniensia, by Münter, 1818, Tom. I. pp. 113—180. The reader will find exact and ample references to the respective treatises of all these authors, in Bleek (ubi supra), p. 130 seq. Never has the work of impartial criticism in respect to these Oracles been thoroughly done, before the effort of Bleek; and even he, wearied of his work before it was finished, has not accomplished all that might be done.]

(e) Testamentum XII. Patriarcharum.

Dr. Nitzsch, in his *De Testamentis XII. Patriarcharum*, 1810, 4to., has shown, according to general concession and in a manner that will not probably be controverted, that the work so entitled is a production of the latter part of the first century, or of the beginning of the second. I can scarcely hesitate, after an attentive study of the contents of the Testaments, in expressing my belief that it was composed shortly after the Apocalypse had obtained circulation. The references to the Apocalypse are, in a few places, quite plain; e. g. Testament Levi, 18, *δώσεις τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς*, comp. Rev. 2: 7; Testament Joseph 19 and Testament Naphtali 5, comp. Rev. 12: 1—6, (a woman clothed with the sun, etc.). The references to the matter of the New Testament history are somewhat numerous, and too plain to be mistaken.

The *plan* of this work seems to have been conceived, from the examples of counsel given on a death-bed by Jacob, Joseph, etc., as well as from the farewell addresses of Moses, Joshua, and others. The twelve patriarchs are successively introduced, as imparting to their posterity their last advice, in respect to their future demeanor. Together with the moral precepts which they are made to utter, is intermingled various matter that has relation to future times; and among the rest, a considerable number of passages that have respect both to the Messiah and the prosperity and triumph of his kingdom. Beyond all reasonable question, the author was a Christian Jew.

The matter and manner of such a work, composed so early as the first century, must be of interest to an interpreter of the sacred books, which were composed at the same period, and by Jewish Christians. Specially do the Messianic passages, and those which respect the church, deserve an attentive perusal and consideration. I shall be as brief in my account of the matter of this production, as the nature of the case will permit.

I. THE TESTAMENT OF REUBEN. It is made up mainly of confession of sin in the matter of Bilhah (Gen. 35: 22), and of Joseph (Gen. 37: 21 seq.); then follow earnest exhortations to his descendants to avoid uncleanness. He warns them, at the close, "to hearken to the sons of Levi [the priests], until the completion of the time of the high priest, the Christ, whom the Lord has promised. The Lord will bless Levi and Judah; in him [i. e. in Judah, as I understand it], the Lord hath chosen a *βασιλεὺς αἰώνων* who shall reign over all people. In c. 2, 3, is a very curious piece of anthropology. "The Lord created man with seven spirits, constituents of his nature; to these Beliar [Belial] has added seven spirits of error. In each case is superadded an *eighth* spirit, *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ὕπνου*, which seems designed to modify the other spirits. Will this help to cast any light on the beast who is the *eighth* king, mentioned in that dark passage of Rev. 17: 11?

II. SIMEON. This is a sermon on envy, and the murderous consequences of it, as exhibited by himself in the matter of Joseph. Toward the close the author proceeds, in the manner of the Sibylline Oracles, to denounce Canaan, Amalek, the Cappadocians, the *Χεττιαῖοι*, i. e. the Romans, and Ham [Egypt]. After their destruction, "the great God of Israel will make his appearance as a man, and save the race of men. All the spirits of error shall be trodden down, and men shall reign over evil spirits. Then shall I [Simeon] arise in gladness, etc. . . . The Lord will raise up from Levi [one] as a high priest, and from Judah one as a king, both God and man, [John the Baptist and Jesus Christ?] So will he save all men."

III. LEVI. This is the longest section of the whole, and it appears pretty plainly, from the manner and matter of its contents, that the author belonged to this tribe, and was zealous for its rights. In a dream he is rapt into heaven and then passes through seven heavens, resembling in some respects those mentioned in the Ascension of Isaiah. There he is told, that "through him and Judah the Lord will appear among men, saving among them every race of men." An account is given to him of each heaven. In the fifth are the *interceding* angels. . . . "When the rocks are rent, the sun extinguished, the waters dried up, fire shrinking away and every creature troubled, when even the invisible spirits are melted,

and Hades itself despoiled, *by the suffering of the Most High*, men, still remaining unbelievers, shall be punished;" c. 4. That is, because they do not believe in the Saviour, they are punished. "Levi is to be made a minister of God, until the Lord shall visit all nations with the tender mercies of his Son forever." Levi is then told, that his posterity will aid in crucifying the son of God, and he is directed to warn them; c. 4.

The gates of the highest heaven are now opened to Levi, and he sees the Most High upon his throne of glory, who says: "Levi, I have given the blessings of the priesthood, *until I shall come and dwell in the midst of Israel;*" [God made manifest in the flesh.] He is then dismissed and commissioned to destroy Shechem [Gen. xxxiv.], an account of which transaction he gives. After this he sees [in a dream] seven men who severally bestow on him the different parts of a priest's and a prophet's costume, and then consecrate him to his office. After a dark passage about the various classes of Levites, the seven [angels] tell him, that "a king will arise from Judah, who will institute a new priesthood, patterned so as to have respect to all nations." In the meantime the priesthood and its privileges are to be his. He is then instructed in its duties, by his grandfather Isaac. He now warns his descendants, that he is innocent as to their future sin, "which they will commit in the end of the world (*ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων*), doing wickedly toward the Saviour of the world, and deceiving Israel." Jerusalem will be destroyed, and the Jews dispersed among all the nations; as the book of Enoch the just predicts. The priests, at a future period, will become exceedingly corrupt, and practice every kind of iniquity. The Jews shall be dispersed for seventy weeks, as the book of Enoch predicts. "The man who renovates the law" will be slain by the wicked priests, who will be ignorant of his resurrection, and know not that by their malignity they have brought innocent blood upon their own heads. Because of this, their place shall be made desolate. The priesthood is then divided into seven Jubilees, which are variously characterized; after these "the Lord will raise up a priest, to whom all his word will be revealed; who will judge righteously; his star shall arise, like that of a king; he shall wax great in the world until his ascension; he shall shine so as to scatter all darkness; peace shall be universal; the heavens shall rejoice, the earth be glad; the knowledge of the Lord shall be poured out upon the earth, as the waters of the seas; the glorious angels of the presence of the Lord shall exult; the heavens shall open, and Holiness [i. e. the Holy Spirit] come down upon him, with the voice of the Father. The glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him. By water shall he bestow the excellence of the Lord upon his sons in truth forever . . . all sin shall cease during his priesthood; the wicked shall rest from evil, and the just shall rest in him. He shall open the gates of paradise, and place there the sword that flamed against Adam, and give his saints to eat of the tree of life, and the spirit of sanctification shall be in them. Beliar shall be bound by him, and to his own children power will be given to tread evil spirits under their feet."

Such is the picture of the Messianic day. It is impossible not to acknowledge here a Christian hand. We recognize also allusions to facts recorded in the New Testament. With a decided Christian belief, however, the author of this work cherished also a decidedly Judaizing spirit, and doubtless was one of those, who believed that the Mosaic rites were still to be continued, even under the Messianic dipsensation.

IV. JUDAH. Much of this section is occupied with recounting his deeds of valour and feats of animal strength in his early youth; some of them indeed silly enough, and others bordering quite too much on the wonderful. E. g. he took a wild buffalo by the horns and swung him around his head; he threw a stone weighing sixty pounds at a giant king, and destroyed him, etc. Then family matters and his incest with Thamar are related, which he attributes to having drunk too much wine. "Wine turns away the mind from truth, whets the appetite of lust, and leads the eyes astray. The spirit of fornication employs wine as its servant for pleasurable gratification; and these two things take away all manly power;" [this, at least, is *sober* preaching]. He warns his children against wine which leads men "to behave scandalously, to transgress without shame, and even to glory in dishonourable things as though they were praiseworthy. . . . There are four evil spirits in it, concupiscence, inflamed passions, luxury, and base gain." He has read in the book of Enoch that his posterity will do all manner of evil. To him is given pre-eminence in earthly things; to Levi, in heavenly ones. A king of his race is coming, who will restore all things, and reign forever. Then follows a Messianic passage of the same tenor with that cited under Testament Levi. At the close he says: "Those who die in sorrow shall rise in joy; those who die in poverty *διὰ κύριον*, shall be made rich; those who die in want, shall be filled; those in weakness, shall be made strong; yea, those who die *διὰ κύριον* shall awake from sleep in life. . . . All people shall glorify the Lord forever." Is not this a plain reference to the persecution and martyrdom of Christians in the primitive age? It casts light on similar exhortations and promises in the Apocalypse.

V. ISSACHAR. This begins with a revolting account of Leah, Rachel, and Jacob's management of conjugal intercourse. Issachar was always industrious, temperate, chaste, and successful in business. He is aware of the future defection and vices of his posterity. He warns against them. He has lived in the practice of all the moral virtues, and he commends them to his children.

VI. ZEBULON. A homily on the laudable quality of sympathy for the distressed. He commiserated Joseph, and helped to save his life. Gives a protracted account of the sale of Joseph, and of transactions connected with it. Israel will be divided into two kingdoms. "After these things, the Light of righteousness, the Lord himself, will arise, with healing and mercy in his wings. He will redeem all the captives of Beliar, and tread down every spirit of error, and turn all nations to the emulation of him; and ye shall see *God in the form of man*, [*θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ φανηρωθείς*] . . . But they will still transgress, and will be rejected until the time of consummation." He [Issachar] will rise again; but the wicked will be subjected to eternal fire, and God will destroy them forever.

VII. DAN. Homily on falsehood and anger. He has read in the book of Enoch, that "Satan will be their prince; that he will lead the sons of Levi and Judah astray; . . . but the salvation of the Lord [the Saviour] shall come from the tribe of Levi and Judah; he shall contend against Beliar and subdue him, and turn the hearts of the disobedient to the Lord, and give eternal peace to all who call upon him. . . . Beware of Satan and his angels; draw near to God, and to the angel who intercedes for you."

VIII. NAPHTALI. Exhortation to beneficence. He has read in the book of Enoch, that his posterity will commit the sins of Sodom; that they shall go into exile; then return, sin again, and again be thrust into exile, until "the man who works righteousness shall come, and show mercy to all afar off and near." Two dreams: Sun and moon he sees descending, and Levi and Judah take hold of

them and are carried aloft, and become all-splendid. Again; standing by the sea with his father and brethren, he sees a ship approach, under full sail, without any sailors. They enter the ship; a great storm arises, and they effect their escape in a way almost miraculous. These dreams, Jacob tells him, are to be fulfilled. "Through Judah salvation to Israel will come. Through his sceptre God will appear, dwelling among men on earth, and will save the race of Israel, and gather the just from all nations."

IX. GAD. Homily on hatred; exemplified by his demeanour toward Joseph. "From Levi and Judah shall arise the Saviour of Israel." His posterity, he foresees, will become very corrupt.

X. ASHER. There are two spirits of evil and good. These lead the soul in opposite directions. Asher knows that his posterity will sin, and be scattered among all the nations of the earth, "until the Most High shall visit the earth, and, coming as a man, eating and drinking with men, in quiet he shall crush the head of the dragon. By water [baptism] shall he save Israel and all nations."

XI. JOSEPH. Chap. 1. gives an account of his sufferings and dangers, and also of his relief and deliverances; the *manner* is seemingly copied from the last part of Matt. xxv. The author then details all the imaginary particulars of Joseph's temptation by the wife of Potiphar; and in the sequel goes back to his history from the time when his brethren sold him, down to the time when he became a servant of Potiphar. He then relates his own beneficence to his brethren, and commends his example to his children. — A dream he had, in which he saw twelve deer, nine of them were scattered [the tribes of Israel, exempting Levi]; afterwards the other three. He saw, that "from Judah was produced a virgin, having a robe of fine linen; and from her came a spotless Lamb; and on his left hand was the similitude of a lion, and all the beasts rushed with violence against him [the Lamb], and the Lamb overcame them, and trode them down. Then angels, and men, and all the earth, rejoiced over him ... Honour Judah and Levi, since from them shall spring the Lamb of God, saving by grace all the nations and Israel. His kingdom is an eternal kingdom, which shall not pass away."

XII. BENJAMIN. He exhorts his posterity to imitate the beneficence of Joseph. If any one loves God and his neighbor, then Beliar, *the spirit of the air*, cannot harm him. Jacob embraced Joseph and said: "In respect to thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven concerning the Lamb of God and Saviour of the world, for he although spotless shall be delivered up for transgressors, and himself although sinless shall die for sinners, by the blood of the covenant for the salvation of Israel and of the Gentiles, and he shall destroy Beliar and his servants." Exhortation to moral virtues, specially to benevolence. From the book of Enoch he knows that the sin of Sodom will be committed by his posterity. But "the Lord himself will take the kingdom, and the twelve tribes shall be gathered together, and all the Gentiles, until the Most High shall send his salvation, by the visitation of the Only-begotten. He shall enter into the first temple, and there the Lord shall be despised, and shall be lifted up on wood [on the cross]; and the veil of the temple shall be rent, and the spirit shall descend upon the nations, like fire that is poured out. Coming up from Hades, he shall ascend from earth to heaven ... We shall rise from the dead, and each worship on his sceptre the king of the heavens, who appeared on earth in the form of humble man; for as many as believed on him while on earth, shall rejoice with him when all shall be raised up, some to glory, and some to dishonour. And the Lord shall first of all judge Israel, for their iniquity toward him, because they did not believe on God the Redeemer who came in the flesh." The section closes, as usual, with moral admonition.

On a review of the contents of this book, one is surprised that it could ever have been doubted, as it has been, whether a *Christian* was the author. The uniformity of the Messianic predictions, near the close of each Testament; the circumstantiality of them, so evidently built on evangelical history; the undissembled reprobation of the wickedness of the Jews, and the declaration of their punishment; all combine to prove, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the work came from a Christian hand. Yet there are many passages which savour plainly of a Jewish feeling, which was too strong to be repressed. But if we consider how strong this feeling generally was in the breasts of Judaizing Christians, we can have no difficulty in accounting for all the paragraphs of this nature which the piece before us exhibits. Nothing is said here of the abolition of the Mosaic rites. The author was no zealous disciple of Paul. And the manner in which he so often speaks of the Saviour as coming *from Judah and from Levi*, evidently shows that the importance of Levi was great in the writer's view. It is somewhat difficult, perhaps, to give any satisfactory account of this peculiarity in the twelve Testaments. Whether the writer means, that Christ shall take the priesthood which was Levi's, and continue it in a modified shape (as is plainly intimated in Testament Judah); or whether (as is more probable) he means to include John the Baptist, descended from a Levitical priest, along with the Messiah; it is somewhat difficult to determine. At all events, the writer plainly shows himself to be of the tribe of Levi, and that probably he had once been an officiating priest.

There is very little in the piece which resembles the costume of the Apocalypse. In Testament Levi is an account of his rapture into heaven; in Testament Naphtali is an account of two dreams, one respecting the descent of the sun and moon, and the other of a shipwreck; in Testament Joseph is a dream respecting the virgin and the Lamb of God; all of which resemble, in their *costume*, some parts of the Old Testament; but there is no angel-interpreter, as in the Apocalypse; nor any continued series of symbols or of imagery. All is simple, prosaic declaration, in which the writer scarcely strives to avoid a tiresome repetition.

The moral tone of the whole piece is high. One cannot but feel, that the writer was a man of ardent feelings in regard to this subject; and there is everywhere an air of great sincerity as well as ardour. Yet the execution of the work developes but moderate talent; and some of it, e. g. in Testament Issachar and Joseph, is revolting to feelings of delicacy. One can never well know what estimate to put on the beauties of composition in the Apocalypse, until he has read other writings contemporary with it, and seen how others succeeded who attempted compositions on the subject of Christ's appearance and kingdom.

No Millennium, in its appropriate sense, appears in the production before us. The resurrection is repeatedly referred to; but not in a way that indicates with certainty a belief in a resurrection like that which John calls the *first*, and which precedes the Millennium. Except with regard to the *moral* virtues, there is a lack of definiteness and explicitness concerning doctrines appropriately Christian. The writer was evidently a novice in Christianity. But the incarnation of the Most High —God—Lord—is mentioned so often as to show that the writer's views on this subject were somewhat definite and developed. He is no advocate of a θεὸς δεύτερος as having become incarnate. He is a full believer, too, in the salvation of the Gentiles.

Let me add, that the Greek of this piece bears no small resemblance to that of the New Testament, and may be read with much profit by one who is seeking for means of explaining the Hebrew-Greek of the sacred books. The style Hebraizes throughout; and the grammatical anomalies of it are nearly on a par with those in the Apocalypse, excepting such as the poetic costume of the latter work occasioned. An attentive and intelligent reader must needs be a gainer, by the study of such a work as the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs.

The Latin translation in Fabricius is poor indeed; and any one who reads it must often go to the Greek of the original, in order to make sense of it. It is labour worse than lost to print such translations.

[The reader will find the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs in Fabricii Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. I. p. 496 seq. The recent Critique by Nitzsch, named on p. 107 above, is the most important. I regret that I was not able to obtain it in due time for consultation. A book so much neglected as these Testaments, and yet so full of interesting matter to the critical student, needs such an editor as Nitzsch.]

(f) The Shepherd of Hermas.

I can scarcely doubt, that the reading of the Apocalypse suggested to the writer of this book the form of his work. It consists of three parts or books; the first contains four *Visions;* the second twelve *Mandates;* the third ten *Similitudes.* The visions and the similitudes contain some things which respect the church, and may be compared in some respects with the matter of the Apocalypse. Yet there is, on the whole, very little that is appropriately apocalyptic in the work before us.

The Visions make the nearest approach to the Apocalypse. In the first, Hermas represents himself as becoming enamoured with a young woman at Rome, who had formerly been a servant in his father's house. While his mind was occupied with this subject he falls asleep, and the Spirit takes him through rough and pathless ways, until he comes to a great plain. There, while praying, heaven opens, and he sees the object of his affection advancing toward him, and hears her accuse him of sinful desires. These he disclaims, and maintains that he cher-

ished only an honourable affection. She informs him that concupiscence in any form or degree is a great sin, directs him to pray for forgiveness, and vanishes.

In grief and sadness he continues his prayer and meditation, and soon an aged woman [the symbol of the church] appears, adorned with splendid vestments and having a book in her hand. She reproves him for concupiscence; but more especially for not governing and restraining his household. She then reads to him from the book in her hand; first, terrific matter; then the following declarations respecting the church: "Behold! the almighty God, who by his invisible power and great intelligence has made the world, and by his counsel worthy of honour has clothed the creation with beauty, and formed the heavens by his all-powerful mandate, and founded the earth upon the waters, who has also established his holy church by his great power, and hath blessed it, behold, he will remove the heavens and the mountains, the hills and the seas, that all things may be filled with his elect; so that he will fulfil the promise which he has made with much honour and joy, should they observe the things which God has ordained, which they have received with much faith."

Four young men now appear and carry away the seat on which the aged woman sat, to the east. She informs Hermas, that the terrible things which she first read, are intended for apostates and heathen. Two men now appear, and bear her away toward the seat that was carried to the east.

Vision II. A year after this, the Spirit bore away Hermas to the same place, which was the scene of his former vision. Here he again sees the aged woman, walking and reading her book. She gives it to him to be copied. As soon as this work was finished, the book vanished. After fifteen days fasting and prayer, the contents of the book are disclosed to him. They respect the sins of his wife and children; to whom he is to read the book in the way of reproof, lest they put off repentance until it be too late. Hermas is bid to warn the church, that they may persevere in obedience; and specially that "they may not yield to the great pressure which is on them [persecution], nor deny him who is their life." Then follow exhortations to kindness, self-denial, and perseverance.

After this a youth appears to him in his sleep, and asks him, who that aged woman was? He answers: A Sibyl. The youth replies, that she is the church, and that she appears old, because the church was constituted before the beginning of the world.

The old woman again appears, and directs him to write two books; one of them he must send to Clement [Clemens Rom. bishop of Rome], the other to Grapte [a supposed deaconess at Rome]. Clement must publish them abroad among the churches; Grapte must read them among the widows and orphans.

Vision III. After repeated fastings, the aged woman again appears and directs him to go into a field. On repairing thither he sees a seat, but no person near it. After praying, the woman again appears, with six young men. She directs them to go and build; while she seats Hermas on the left part of the settee, telling him that the right hand part of it is reserved as the place of honour for martyrs, (illorum est qui jam meruerunt Deum, et passi sunt causa nominis ejus), . . . "who have endured wild beasts, scourgings, imprisonment, the cross, for his name's sake." She then directs his attention to a great tower, that was being built over the water with splendid squared stones. The six youth were engaged in building it, and were assisted by many thousands of others. Some of the stones were taken from the abyss, and were all exactly fitted; some from the land, which were partly used and partly rejected. Many stones lay around the tower which were not employed, some of them being rough, some full of seams, some round or

ill fitted for building. Some were thrown away at a great distance, and rolled into a desert place; others rolled into the fire; others came near to the water, but could not enter it.—In the sequel the woman tells him, that the tower is built on the water, because salvation is by water. The youths are angels preeminent; the other assistants, angels of inferior order. The stones well squared and shining are apostles, bishops, teachers, and ministers, who have taught and ministered well to the elect of God, and who have fallen asleep. As to the stones brought from the land unhewed, only a part of them are accepted. Those employed in the building are the new converts. Those that lie near the building unemployed, are such as have sinned and are willing to do penance, [the Greek here, no doubt, was *μετανοεῖν*]; those thrown at a distance are reprobates. Such as are not put into the building, never can be received when it is once completed.

In like manner, all the different kinds of stones which are rejected, are made symbolical of different classes of sinners, which are described at length. Hermas inquires, whether penitence will avail anything, for such as have been rejected; the answer is that it will, in case it takes place while they are undergoing their chastisement, and before the days of punishment are completed. [The germ of purgatory.]

Hermas then sees seven women around the tower. These, he is told, are the seven Christian graces, faith, abstinence, simplicity, innocence, modesty, discipline, charity. He then desires to know when the consummation of the building will take place, and is told: "Cito consummabitur." This Hermas is enjoined to publish. Then follows an exhortation to alms-giving and to mutual love and a pacific spirit.

The six young men who superintended the building of the tower, now come and take away the aged woman to the tower, while four others transport her seat thither. As she was going, Hermas inquires why she had assumed three different forms in her appearances to him; first as an old and infirm woman throughout; secondly, with somewhat of a juvenile face; thirdly as younger and with a cheerful and smiling aspect. She explains this by telling him that when she first appeared to him, all his graces were in a feeble and as it were superannuated condition, which was symbolized by her appearance; that when she next appeared, with a younger visage, he was like to an aged person who renews his strength on the hearing of good tidings, which Hermas had in like manner heard. Her third appearance, which was still more youthful and vigorous, was a symbol of Hermas' state who had become more cheerful and vigorous, after fasting so much and having so many revelations imparted to him.

Thus ends this chapter of *visions*; which betrays great poverty of intellect and imagination, with feeble conceptions and very little taste for congruity of representation. It appears to me, also, that here are some indices of a *later* period than the commencement of the second century; but of this I shall speak in the sequel.

Vision IV. Twenty days after his former vision, he goes into the solitary fields, and there, after awhile, he sees first a great cloud of dust, and then, on nearer approach, a huge monster like a whale, vomiting forth fiery locusts. It was 100 feet in length, and its head was like an urn, and its mouth as if it might swallow up the city. Armed with faith Hermas comes near, and the monster only throws out its tongue at him. Its head was striped with black, red, golden, and white. Passing the monster, a virgin soon meets him splendidly adorned. This was the

church. She assures Hermas that he had escaped the great beast, by putting his trust in God, who only is able to deliver. This beast [imitated from the Apocalypse xiii. seq.] was the symbol of "oppression yet to come." If the church will prepare for it, and put her trust in God, she shall also escape. The four colours are symbolical; the *black* is this dark world; the *red* means that the wicked age must perish by blood and fire; the *golden*, that some will, like gold that is purified, come out from the fire when their dross shall be purged away; the *white* represents the world to come, when all shall be pure and clean. These things Hermas is enjoined to publish; and then the virgin disappears with a loud sound.

Book II. This consists of *Twelve Mandates*, moral and paraenetic. The Angel of Penitence appears to Hermas, in the habit of a traveller, and delivers these mandates. They concern faith in God; the avoiding of slander and the doing of alms; the shunning of falsehood and penitence on account of dissimulation; the dismission of an adulteress; sadness of heart and patience; the two angels of good and of evil; the fear of God, and boldness against demons; turning away from evil and doing good; persevering and confident prayer; a gloomy mind which offends the Spirit; the trial of spirits by observing their respective operations; the desire of good and avoidance of evil, also the possibility of keeping God's commands, and exhortation not to fear the devil.

There is much of dry and empty repetition in many of them; also a leaning toward superstition in respect to angels and demons, and in regard to the matter of penitence. The moral tone is in itself pure and high; but the views of the writer are narrow, and his manner very unattractive. There is nothing here, except the *machinery* which the writer employs, which contains any resemblance to the Apocalypse in general, and scarcely any even to the hortatory epistles which stand at the commencement of the book.

Book III. Similitudes. These exhibit the continued address of the angel who delivered the Mandates. Similitude I. is a homily against avarice and luxury, and an exhortation to charity. Similitude II. Hermas walks into the fields, and sees a vine covering an elm-tree and loaded with fruit. The angel appears, and tells him that the elm symbolizes the rich man, who is poor in good works; the vine represents the poor man, who attaches himself to the rich, prays for him, and thus procures for him many good things which he would not otherwise obtain. Thus the poor and the rich unitedly bring forth more fruit than either would alone. Similitude III. The angel shows him trees whose leaves had fallen off. These, appearing like dead trees, resemble the just who mix with the world and conform to them, and thus appear as if they were dead to spiritual things. Similitude IV. The angel shows him trees, a part of which are green and flourishing, and a part of them dry. The former symbolize the righteous in a future world; the latter, the wicked who will be burned in the fire.

Similitude V. After fasting, Hermas retires to a mountain, and there the angel again appears, and tells him that his external fasting is not a true and real fast. That such a one consists in preserving the mind pure, and in cultivating the spirit of obedience. The similitude employed in the sequel is that of a servant, commanded to keep a vine safely and hedge it about; which he not only did, but diligently cultivated it, by digging the earth around it, etc. When his lord came, he not only rewarded him for doing what he had commanded, but also

for his additional care and efforts. So it will be with those who keep fasts, i. e. truly keep them. [The germ of merit in works supererogatory]. Afterwards the angel says, that the farm on which the vine is planted, represents the world; the son, the Holy Spirit; the faithful servant, the Saviour; the vine, his people; the hedge about it, his messengers, etc.

SIMILITUDE VI. The angel takes Hermas again into the fields, and shows him a shepherd superbly clad, and exulting in his sporting flocks; this is the genius of pleasure, etc. He then shows another, of a stern and severe look and demeanor; this is the angel of punishment. A part of the sheep, who are not irreclaimable, will be punished a year for each day of sin, and thus they will be reclaimed. SIMILITUDE VII. Hermas goes into the field sad and dejected because of his sufferings and those of his house. The angel again appears and admonishes him to be patient; for he and his house have sinned. If he is patient, he will in the end reap an ample reward, and also his house. He promises to procure some remission of their sufferings from the angel of punishment.

SIMILITUDE VIII. This presents a curious symbol, which is carried out with a minuteness of detail that becomes tedious, although it is not destitute of ingenuity. Hermas is shown a vast spreading willow under which all the elect of the Lord are gathered. An angel cuts off small boughs or rods from it, and gives to all who stand under it. The tree still remains undiminished in its magnitude. After a time all the rods are demanded from each. Some of them were dry and putrid as if worm-eaten; others simply dry; then half dry, half dry with incisions, one half entirely dry, one third, two thirds, the mere end of the rod dry with incisions, wholly dry; then follow the rods wholly green; some with additional shoots and others with shoots loaded with fruit. This latter class, i. e. all who have flourishing rods, are all admitted into the tower, and clothed in splendid white vestments. As to all others, whose rods were partially or wholly dry, the angel orders their rod to be planted in a moist place; in order to see whether they will sprout again. In the sequel, all present their rods to him; most of them had acquired some virescence, but this was very different in degree. The remainder of a long chapter is then occupied with describing the respective classes of Christians to whom these rods belonged, and whose condition was symbolized by the state of the rod. Some were dry and rotten, some dry, some half dry, some simply virescent, some frondescent, some frutescent, etc. Each one is admitted to such a place in the tower, or on the walls around it, as the state of his rod indicates that he ought to be. Those with rods wholly dry, or dry and rotten, are excluded and sent away to punishment, there being no more place for repentance.

The explanation of the angel is, that the willow tree means the law over all the world; those under its shade, believers; the angel who superintended the rods, etc., is Michael, the guardian angel of God's people; the rods are the law which he has put into their hearts; the presentation and examination of the rods, is the final trial of men, etc. There is a little of the romantic about some parts of the allegory, which make it a matter of more interest than is attached to most of this writer's similitudes. At the same time, the doctrine of *agere penitentiam* (*do penance*) is plainly to be found here in its initial state; and the great importance of performing this duty during probation, is exhibited by the whole process of setting out the rods in moist land and waiting for their vegetation.

SIMILITUDE IX. Hermas is led to a high mountain of Arcadia, from which he sees a great plain, surrounded by twelve mountains. These were, the first black, the next smooth without vegetation, the third overrun with thorns and thistles,

the fourth full of half-dried herbage, the fifth rough and with vegetation, the sixth full of fissures with withering vegetation on their sides, the seventh covered with flourishing vegetation, the eighth full of water-springs and brooks, the ninth dry and full of serpents, the tenth full of lofty shade-trees, the eleventh full of fruit-trees loaded with fruit, and the twelfth white and shining in a most splendid manner. Hermas then sees a vast white rock in the plain, higher than any of the mountains, with a newly carved gate-way. Twelve virgins stand as porters. Six lofty men now appear, and call others to assist them, in building a tower over this gate-way. The virgins help forward the work. Ten white stones are then brought from the deep, and put into the tower; then other twenty-five stones, then thirty-five, then forty more, all from the deep. Next stones are brought from the mountains around. Of these some remained of the same colour, and some changed their colour; the former not being introduced through the gate by the virgins, and not being homogeneous with the rest of the building, were removed from the tower. The structure was reared in one day, but not completed. The coming of the Lord of the tower is to be waited for, before it is completed. He comes after a little time accompanied by all the builders, and examines all the stones, and orders those which are unfit to be taken out of the building. Others dug from a quarry in the plain, are put in their stead. Those which had been rejected were ordered to be fitted anew, so far as might be done. Many, on trial, proved to be incapable of being fitted for the buildings. Twelve women, dressed in black, beautiful in appearance, without girdles, and with bare shoulders, are ordered to carry away the rejected stones to the mountains. Hermas is left in the keeping of the porter-virgins, during a short absence of the angel-interpreter. Soon he returns, and the explanation commences.

The great white rock is the Son of God; the new gate, his incarnate condition; the builders are the angels; none can enter the kingdom of God, except through the new gate. The tower is the church; the twelve virgins, the porters, are the graces which the Spirit of Christ bestows; the stones cast away are reprobates, and such as have greatly transgressed; but if these last will repent, they may be again received. The virgins are faith, abstinence, resolution, patience, etc. The women in loose attire are perfidy, intemperance, unbelief, pleasure, etc. The first ten stones put into the tower are the first age of Christianity; the twenty are the second: the thirty-five are prophets and ministers of the Lord; the forty the apostles and teachers of gospel-doctrines. The taking of the stones from the water, denotes the efficacy of baptism as a preparation for the kingdom of heaven. When the apostles were dead, they went and preached to those *qui ante obierunt*, and gave to them this sign [baptism]. These come up from the water, *vivi*. [A germ of Purgatory.]

Hermas then obtains an explanation of what is symbolized by the different character and appearance of the twelve mountains around the plain. These designate different classes of Christians, of hypocrites, reprobates, etc., which the author particularizes even to great and tedious length. The twelfth mountain only deserves particular remark. It is all white and shining; a symbol of those "who believe without dissimulation, like infants, who will be more especially honoured, . . . Omnes enim infantes honorati sunt apud Dominum, et primi habentur." [Such seems to have been the general feeling of the primitive age of Christianity.]

There is very much of tedious and arid repetition in this ninth Similitude. The imagination of the *tower*, as described in Vision III, seems to have haunted the mind of the author with so much urgency, or at least filled it with so much de-

light, that he could not forbear the echo of it again in this place, with some variations; and he has prolonged the echo much beyond the original sound.

SIMILITUDE X. Exhortation *agere poenitentiam*. Hermas must exhort others to do the same. The angel shepherd, i. e. the angel of penitence, will be sent to dwell with him; also the virgins, i. e. the Christian graces. If he perseveres and keeps his house pure, then they will continue their abode with him. Kindness and charity are to be exercised toward all. Hermas must do these things forthwith, and diligently, lest the building of the tower should be completed and he be excluded.

The intelligent reader will perceive at once, that there is very little in the Shepherd of Hermas, which compares well with the Apocalypse, excepting what may be named the *machinery* of the piece, i. e. the intervention of angels, the frequent employment of symbols, and the warnings and threatenings which have some resemblance in point of matter to those in the epistles to the seven churches, Rev. ii. iii. But it is highly profitable to read such a book as this of Hermas, were it for no other purpose than to learn the immeasurable difference there is between the Apocalypse and other productions of early ages, which are more or less modelled after it. The barren imagination, the feeble conceptions, the dry and aphoristic style, the repetitions so often iterated, the childish conceits, the monkish ascetics, of the Shepherd of Hermas—all place it immeasurably below the work of John, and show how completely the factitious efforts of early times to imitate him, failed in all important respects. One needs but to survey the whole ground with his own eyes, in order to be entirely convinced of the correctness of these remarks.

Undoubtedly some allowance is to be made for the *Latin* dress in which the Shepherd is presented to us. The original was Greek, a few passages of which have been preserved by quotation, and are presented in the edition of Cotelerius I. p. 75 seq. The translation, like that of Irenaeus, is in general a dead literality, (if I may be allowed the expression); and somewhat frequently it is obscure because the translator does not seem to have fully understood the meaning of his original. It seems to me also, that some of the version is tinctured with the religious views of the times when it was made. Thus *μετανοέω* is rendered *agere poenitentiam* (to do penance), as we know from the examples where the Greek text is preserved; e. g. p. 97, *ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσει*, Lat. si non poenitentiam egerit; p. 101, *ἵνα ἡ μετάνοια αὐτῶν καθαρὰ γένηται*, where the Latin is: Ut poenitentiam agant et poenitentia eorum munda fieret; p. 109, *ἂν δὲ μετανοήσωσι καὶ ἀνανήψωσι*, Lat. et cum coeperint delictorum agere poenitentiam, tunc ascendunt in praecordia eorum opera sua. Here the same spirit was operating, which has led one part of the church in modern times to translate *μετανοεῖτε* by *do penance*. Besides; one needs only to compare the Greek passages with the Latin, in order to see that, notwithstanding its literality, it has often indulged in diffuse paraphrase.

Independently however of any errors of translation, it lies upon the face of the whole work, that it was written by an ascetic, who laid undue stress upon fasts and vigils, and had some superstitious views in regard to other subjects. Thus (p. 70) sexual inclination seems to be represented as being in itself a sin; the tower (p. 79) built on the water signifies, that "vita nostra per aquam salva facta est, et fiet;" apostles and teachers "have died and *preached to those who were dead*," plainly said on p. 120; penitence may be attained to, after a first trial and rejection, i. e. may be obtained in purgatory, p. 80; offenders of a certain class will be sent to another place, where they will repent, and then be admitted into the tower [the heavenly church] after they have once been excluded, p. 80, col. 2; omnis rogatio humilitate eget, jejuna ergo et percipies a Domino quod postulas, i. e. the penance of fasting is peculiarly grateful to God, p. 81. Celibacy, also, is earnestly recommended, p. 90; works of supererogation inculcated: Si autem praeter ea quae mandavit Dominus, aliquid boni adjeceris, majorem dignitatem tibi conquires, et honoratio apud Dominum eris quam eras futurus, p. 106. Besides these strong marks of a later age, Hermas speaks of "apostles, bishops, teachers, and ministers . . . who have taught, etc." (p. 80); and on p. 113 he characterizes one sort of offenders in the church, as having "contentionem de principatu et dignitate." These and other things of the like nature point, as it seems to me, very clearly to a later age than the close of the first century, as the period when the Pastor of Hermas was written.

Accordingly we find no notice of this work in Justin Martyr, who is sufficiently prone to advert to works of this nature. But Irenaeus and Tertullian and Clemens Alex. quote it, the latter oftentimes. Of these, however, only Tertullian ascribes the authorship to Hermas. But Origen has often quoted it; and in one place (Explanat. in Rom. 16: 14), he says: "I think the Hermas there mentioned [viz. in Rom. 16: 14] is the writer of the book called *Pastor;* which writing appears to me to be very useful, and as I suppose, divinely inspired." One would hardly deem it possible for Origen to entertain such an opinion respecting a performance like that before us, when he is usually quite cautious in regard to apocryphal books. As an offset for this criticism, however, we have the opinion of the author of the anonymous fragment on the Canon in Muratori, who declares that "Hermas, in the city of Rome, very lately wrote the Pastor, Pius his brother being bishop of the Romish church." If this be correct, then was the book written about A. D. 150. Earlier than this, the internal evidence does not fairly permit us to believe that it was composed.

That such a book should have gained the credit it did in ancient times, must be owing more to its conformity to the fashion of the day, than to

its merits. Its ascetics are rigid and pure; its *symbolical* character commended it to Origen, who was much devoted to allegory, and to whom the Canticles was the most precious part of all the Old Testament, for there he could sail, as Jerome says, "cum pleno velo." With the Canon, however, it was rarely ranked. Tertullian speaks of it with ineffable contempt, after he became a Montanist: "Scriptura Pastoris, quae sola in moechos amat," de Pud. c. 10. Even Origen says, more than once: Si cui tamen libellus ille recipiendus videtur; Hom. I. in Ps. 37. So in Hom. 8 in Num. So again: Libello Pastoris, qui a nonnullis contemni videtur, Philoc. c. 1; and thus elsewhere. The reader will find all the quotations of Hermas by the earlier fathers, in Cotelerius, Patt. Apostol. I. p. 68 seq. How this could be deemed *revera utilis liber*, as Jerome calls it (Catal. Script. Ecc. v. Hermas), can be accounted for, as it seems to me, only in the way that I have already suggested above.

In the mean time its excellence, or want of excellence, is not the main question with us at present. Our object is, to find by the reading of this book, what kind of views and taste was common at the time in which it was written. The author, in Vision II. ad fin., plainly intends to lead his readers to suppose, that he lived in the time of Clement of Rome, inasmuch as he mentions directions given to him by the angel, to present Clement with a copy of the book which the aged woman had bidden him to transcribe. I cannot but look on this as a designed effort to conceal the true age of the author. Let any one come to the reading of him, fresh from the perusal of works which really belong to the first century, and he can entertain no doubts, at least it strikes me so, that the work before us must be assigned to a later date. Bleek says that he finds no evidence to satisfy his mind, that it is not among the earliest productions. How can he have read it with scrutinizing attention? F. Lücke, on the other hand, (Einleit. in die Apoc. p. 142 seq.), assigns it to the middle of the second century; in which I fully concur.

[The reader will find most of the literature which he needs respecting Hermas, in Cotelerius. His *Judicium de S. Hermae Pastore* (Vol. 1. p. 73), however, shows a strong leaning to traditional authority. He pronounces all the accusations brought against the work, to be founded *frivolo aut nullo fundamento*. So, as a Romanist, he might think; for purgatory, and penance, and celibacy, all find their earliest supports in the Pastor. Besides the common judgment respecting the work, contained in ecclesiastical histories, the reader will find a short *critique* in Lücke (Einl. p. 141 seq); also in all the Bibliothecas of ancient ecclesiastical authors. The book needs a new editor, and a much more thorough sifting than it has yet received.]

(g) The apocryphal Apocalypse of John.

An attempt to mend the work of John, even under his name and with most evident plagiarism, could hardly have been expected. Yet in an age when compositions of this nature abounded to an excessive degree, such an attempt was made; and it bears the title of *Ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου . . . Ἰωάννου.*

No ancient writer has mentioned this production, excepting Theodosius, *the grammarian* as he is called. Of this writer we know but little. He is supposed by some to have been a native of Alexandria, and to have belonged to the corps of Byzantine grammarians. Some of his treatises on grammar have been lately published; but his age, and country even, remain undecided. In his *Ἐρωτήματα περὶ τῶν προσῳδιῶν* he says: "Another apocalypse bears the name *τοῦ θεολόγου* [an appellation of John the author of the Apocalypse]; but we do not say that it belongs to him of the isle of Patmos. *Μὴ γένοιτο*! For this is most true and real [*ἀληθεστάτη ἐστίν*]; but we speak of one which is pseudonymous and belongs to a different author."* The contents of this production will show that it belongs to a late age, and is deserving of very little consideration.† They are as follows:

John, after the ascension of Christ, goes to mount Tabor. There he prays, and requests that it may be revealed to him, when Christ will come again on earth, and what changes will ensue in consequence of his coming.

After seven days of prayer, a bright cloud takes him away toward heaven. He hears a voice saying: "Hear, holy John, and understand." He then perceives heaven opened, smells a most grateful perfume, and streams of light pour down upon him. He then sees a book with seven seals, as thick as seven mountains, and so long that no man could measure it. This is the book which concerns the future. He desires to know its contents. These are disclosed: first there will be an abundance of corn and wine; then a scarcity. Then Antichrist will come, in a fearful form. The heavens will be as brass; there will be no dew, no rain, cloud, or wind. Three years will Antichrist reign, and then Enoch and Elijah will come to expose his deceit. But they will perish; and all men with them. The angels will then be sent to blow the trumpet and wake the dead to life. All distinction of sex, rank, etc., will then cease. The angels will next be sent over all the earth, to get together all that is valuable, *the holy images*, and vessels of the

* The reader will find an account of Theodosius, and of his published works, in Schoell's Geschichte d. Griech. Lit. III. p. 173. It is somewhat singular, that this obscure writer should be the only one that seems to have noticed the apocryphal book in question.

† I have not the Auctarium Cod. Apoc. of Birch at hand, which contains the only printed copy of this apocryphal work, in Fasc. I. p. 243—260; unless, indeed, Thilo has republished it in his Corpus of apocryphal productions. My account of the work, therefore, is taken from Lücke's Einl. I. p. 146 seq.

churches, *the precious crucifixes*, and the holy books. The Lord will take his sceptre in his hand, and all angels will fall prostrate, all human beings be elevated to heaven. All the evil spirits, and Antichrist whom they aid, will be swept off the earth by clouds. The Lord will send the angels to burn up the earth and all that is in it; and thus all will be purified. The earth will then say: I am a young virgin, and there is no sin in me. An angel will then appear and proclaim the coming of the Lord. Heaven and earth will shake at the sound; the heavens will open, and the new Jerusalem with delightful odour come down, adorned as a bride for her husband. Then Christ will descend in majesty and pomp, with myriads of angels and archangels, who bear his throne, and sing the *trisagion*. The judgment will follow. The seven seals of the great book will be opened. The opening of the first will make the stars to fall; of the second, will eclipse the sun; of the third, will melt down the heavens; of the fourth, will make the moon to fall; of the fifth, will rend the earth in pieces; of the sixth, will bring Hades to destruction; of the seventh, will dry up the sea. Then follows the judgment of the evil spirits of Antichrist. They will be cast into outer darkness, into a gulf so deep, that a heavy stone would not reach the bottom in falling three years. Unbelieving Greeks and heathen are next judged, and cast into Hades, [the writer forgets that the opening of the sixth seal had destroyed Hades]; then the Jews, who crucified the Saviour, will be cast into Tartarus. Those who bear the name of Christians will be separated, true Christians will be placed on the right hand of the judge, and will shine in glory; hypocrites on the left hand, and be covered with darkness. The faithful will then live in an earthly paradise, and angels with them; and all evil and trouble and earthly vicissitudes will cease.

John is commanded to impart these things to faithful men, and not to cast his pearls before swine. A cloud then brings him back to mount Tabor, and the writer concludes with a doxology.

Is it not now one of the most extraordinary conceits that ever entered the mind of man, that the genuine Apocalypse was to be bettered by such a substitute as this? Not a few compositions, however, of ancient times exist, that can well claim a near affinity to this in point of style and spirit.

Two or three circumstances fully settle the question as to the lateness of the age in which this must have been written. One is, the mention of *holy images* and *precious crucifixes;* which are known to have been common and counted sacred in churches, only since the fourth century. The writing also mentions *πατριάρχαι* as an order among Christians; but this designation did not come into use, until the fifth century.

The writer appears to have confounded the Millennium of John with the period which is to follow the general judgment; and to be so much of a *ψυχικός* in his conceptions, that an earthly paradise is the *beau ideal* of his heaven. No wonder that his production obtained but very little notice at any period.

(h) General Remarks on the preceding Apocryphal Compositions.

The reader must not mistake my design in the exhibition of these relics of the early ages. Nothing can be further from my intention, than to place them by the side of the Apocalypse of John, as possessing similar value and authority. Indeed, I know of no more successful way for any one to convince himself that the writer of the canonical Apocalypse was entirely a different man from any of the authors of the fictitious Revelations—different not in his individual person merely, but in his views, feelings, special objects aimed at, and conscious mastery of all the subjects which he undertook to exhibit—than to read the apocryphal books which I have examined. Others may account for this difference as they judge best; but as to the actual difference in question, I am ready to believe that no intelligent man, well acquainted with the subject, will attempt to deny it. For myself I am persuaded, that the spirit which animated the feelings and enlightened the mind of John, was distinct from, and far superior to, the spirit which controlled the feelings and views of the apocryphal writers in question.

Ewald, as has already been intimated, makes the supposition (p. 9), that John has largely drawn from the book of Enoch. I have already given the reasons why I cannot assent to this. All the apocryphal works now before us, bear marks of a composition subsequent to, or independent of, the Apocalypse. And if I am asked, as it is natural I should be, why then I have brought them to view and dwelt upon them so long; my answer is not difficult. They exibit the *taste* and the *usus loquendi* of the age in which they were written. The simple fact, that there are so many of these compositions at and near the close of the first century, of itself shows the demand in which they stood among Christians, and in some respects even among Jews. Why should this form of composition be chosen, and resorted to by so many, if the popular demand were not such as to secure it some good degree of favorable reception?

If now we make the supposition, that the Apocalypse of John led the way in compositions of an apocalyptic nature during the first century, and gave to them a popularity which called forth other works in a somewhat similar style; then it would follow of course, that the Apocalypse must very early have been popular to a high degree, even so as to control the taste of the Christian community. But if this be doubted, then we must still concede, that the taste of the day, whatever were the causes of it, demanded works of such a cast. Whether this taste had gradually arisen from the favorite study of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, or whatever might have called it forth, nothing can be plainer, than

that John wrote the Apocalypse in such a manner as was adapted to meet the desires and wishes of the times in which he lived. He might have communicated all the simple historical or didactic truth which he has now taught, within the compass of a single chapter, by plain, prosaic, and direct propositions, without any allegory or continued symbols. But if he had, it would neither have made so deep an impression on the mind and memory of his readers, nor given them so much pleasure by its perusal. Why might he not prefer *symbol*, as well as the writers of the 18th Psalm, of Is. xiv, and of many parts of Ezekiel, of Daniel, and of Zechariah?

When the reader is well aware of this general ground, he will see more plainly the object I had in view, in dwelling upon the apocryphal works that are contemporary, or nearly so, with the Apocalypse. The general taste and feeling, in respect to works of this nature, are thus illustrated. Nor is this by any means even the principal good to be derived from a knowledge of such works. The *usus loquendi* of the day, in regard to sacred things and symbols, as well as the costume of predictions respecting the future, has more or less of light cast upon them by almost every page of an apocryphal work. Bombastic, declamatory, and even puerile, as many of the Sibylline Oracles are, yet inasmuch as they are *poetry*, (which the Apocalypse also in its essence is), and some of them precede and some synchronize with the Apocalypse, and others follow it, they help much to show the spirit and feeling and taste of the day, and cast light on many an idiom and mode of description which John employs.

As an example in point, I may again refer to the description of the *beast*, at the close of chap. xiii, where his *number* is said to be 666. This has been called Cabbalistic, mystical, puerile, fanciful, and what not, by some ancient and many recent writers. Yet we may show, (as I have done above, p. 102 seq.), that the contemporaries of John did not regard this subject in such a light; yea, we may even venture to suggest, that under the circumstances in which John wrote, some such method of concealing partially the individual aim of the writer, was quite expedient.

There is another and most important influence, which the perusal of such works as apocryphal revelations will almost insure. It is a *familiarity* with style and imagery, such as pertain to apocalyptic writings. A man who has never read any work kindred to the Apocalypse, may naturally feel that many things are very peculiar and strange in it. He is led, insensibly perhaps, to feel that there is something visionary or enthusiastic in the style of John, and begins after awhile to read him with less respect than he reads Paul or Luke. But let him once steep himself (if I may be allowed so to speak) in the *usus loquendi* and the

favourite style of the day, what before appeared strange or fanciful, is no longer capable of producing such an impression. The nearer he can come to such a state of feeling and views as belonged to the contemporaries of John, the less will he find which is strange, or which excites surprise, in the style and imagery of the Apocalypse.

The reader will permit me to refer to a familiar illustration. Nothing can appear more strange, or enthusiastic and extravagant, to a calm occidental man, than the language employed in the intercourse between the higher and lower ranks in Persia. Yet by the time that one has read through Sir John Malcolm's Notes on Persia, Morier's Hadji Baba and Zohrab, and also Fraser's Kuzzil Bash, (not much, if any, inferior in characterizing to either of the preceding works), he begins to sit as quietly under Persian compliments, and displays of titles, and professions of warm devotedness, as he does under the ordinary modes of address and professions of respect and obedience in our western world. Everything of such a nature depends on the fashion of the times for its real meaning, and of course on the proper light in which it is to be viewed. The man who has never made the experiment, cannot well foretel what effect it will produce upon his feelings, and even his criticisms, with respect to any book of antiquity. It is—it must be—true, that every book, when written by a man of sense who designs to instruct, is and must be conformed to the spirit and the dialect of the times in which it was written. Do we judge amiss then, when we say, that everything which helps to acquire a *familiarity* with that spirit and that dialect, must be useful in the explanation of any particular work? This familiarity may evidently be much improved, by reading the apocryphal revelations in question. One sits down, after such a process, in company with the Apocalypse, as with an acquaintance already more than half familiar to him.

How exceedingly different such a slow and gradual process of gaining a knowledge of the apocalyptic style and method is, from that which judges of John's meaning by *a priori* reasoning, determining what he does mean by what they think he ought to mean, or by judging hastily and lightly from mere appearances and first impressions, or from mystical and cabbalistic views—no one needs to be told who is a just and proper judge of these matters. It surely is not every tyro, who can well explain the Apocalypse. Well will it be, indeed, if solid scholarship and several decades of study, can even begin to afford the requisite explanations. It is the *manner* of the book which makes this difficulty—the manner as viewed by us during our first impressions, and without due preparation for reading it. It is not to be reasonably supposed, that John's contemporaries experienced the same difficulty.

To sum up all in a few words: John wrote in order to be read and

understood; and therefore intelligent persons of his day might understand him. If they did, it was by virtue of familiarity with language and imagery such as he employed. Now whatever helps us to place ourselves in a situation like to that of John's original readers, helps us to read his book intelligently. It follows of course, that the apocryphal books, written at or near his time, which exhibit to us either the language or the style and imagery of that period, must afford us important aid in reading and understanding the Apocalypse.

All comparison of their value in respect to instruction, or in relation to aesthetics, with that of the Apocalypse, will only serve to show their insignificance, and the immeasurable superiority of the canonical Revelation. But even for such a purpose, a comparison of them is of serious importance.

§ 7. *Peculiar form and arrangement of the Apocalypse.*

The considerations in regard to this subject which I design in this place to bring to view, are, in several respects, only of a more general nature. Minute particulars in which the Apocalypse differs, as to diction or the turn of thought, from other writings either canonical or uncanonical, must be reserved for the detail of representation, either in the Introduction or the Commentary. What will be here said has respect to *peculiar form and arrangement.*

(1) When we institute a comparison between John and the ancient Hebrew prophets, there is one circumstance at the outset which immediately commands our attention. No prophecy of the Old Testament is thrown into the form of an *epistle.* Nearly all of the prophecies in the Hebrew Scriptures have the form of an *address,* or (as we may say) of a *sermon;* and in nearly all there is mingled much of warning, reproof, exhortation, and the like. In this latter respect the Apocalypse bears indeed a close resemblance; for throughout the whole composition, the writer gives a practical turn to everything which he introduces, and often admonishes, warns, and encourages. But John is alone in addressing his whole work to particular communities of the pious, prefixed by individual *epistles* to the same. In these epistles he has developed the true state of things among the churches of his day, and shown what was the real condition of them which called forth the work before us.

As Lücke has well remarked, we must not regard the inscription of his work to the seven churches of Asia, in the light of a mere *dedication.* It was not to procure favour and patronage for the Apocalypse, that the writer adopted such a measure. The churches in question were deeply concerned with the contents of the work. They were exposed to the dangers and trials which it discloses, and to the apostasy against

which it so anxiously warns. No measure could be better adapted to secure their attention to the book, than the one which John chose, viz. that of addressing them individually by epistle. In the main body of his work, he introduces warnings and admonitions which belong to all of them in common. But in the epistles, he finds opportunity of saying some things which are appropriate to the particular condition of each church. So soon as he has done this, the epistolary form of the composition is abandoned, and the writer betakes himself to a method of representation, which is free from any of the embarrassments that a continuance of it might have occasioned. The transition however, in chap. iv, is so easy and natural, that most readers scarcely notice it. This circumstance shows the tact of the writer; and the whole plan of the work shows, at all events, the independence of its author, and the originality of his conceptions, notwithstanding the very numerous subordinate resemblances, in parts of the work, to passages in the Old Test. Scriptures.

When the prophetic part of the work is completed, the writer returns, in chap. 22: 16 seq., to his direct address to the churches, and with striking effect. He leaves a deep impression on the reader of earnestness and sincerity.

(2) So far as John has followed any model in the form of his work, as it respects the use of symbols, he may be said to have conformed particularly to Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. In his symbols he most of all resembles Daniel; in his *angelic machinery*, (so to speak), he resembles both Daniel and Zechariah i—viii. Even these prophets, however, less frequently employ agencies of this nature, than the writer of the Apocalypse.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is there such *an uninterrupted and continuous employment of symbols*, as in the Apocalypse. Nearly all the prophets occasionally resort to this kind of composition. Yet it is unfrequent, and usually very brief, everywhere except in the three prophets already named. Even there, it is brief and interrupted, in comparison with what we find it to be in the book before us. In this the symbols are so arranged, that one part necessarily runs into another, and thus makes out a series of continuous and mutually related parts. While a minute examination will disclose the continual variety which the writer introduces in his light and shade, yet the great outlines of all parts of the work are so drawn, as to show that a mutual relation to, and dependence on, each other, is a matter of calculation and design. I could no more bring myself to believe, that different writers composed fragments of this book which were afterwards brought together by some other hand, than I could believe that the different parts of a watch were accidentally and independently invented, and were finally adjusted to-

gether by some person skilful in making compounds. The sequel will cast further light on this part of our subject.

That John differs strikingly, in many respects, from most of the *earlier* Hebrew prophets, will be felt by every discerning reader. Not that the latter are wanting in figurative language, bold metaphors, glowing comparisons, and in occasional symbols. But there is in them far more of *preaching* than of prediction. For the most part, also, they are more concerned with the proximate than with the remote future; and, if we except Is. xl—lxvi, nearly all the pictures of the distant future are but merely brief sketches. The peculiarity of Is. xl—lxvi. has been urged against its early composition, and not without some show of reason, if mere analogy were competent to decide such a question. John, however, not only uses figurative language and metaphor abundantly, but he introduces symbols of such a nature, that a gradual development of them is so made out as to carry on (if I may thus express it) the representation of a long series of historic actions. In Daniel, indeed, we find several pieces of a similar character; but even here, the representations are quite brief compared with those in the Apocalypse.

(3) In regard to the particular method of the disclosures made to John, it differs somewhat from all others in the Scripture. It is not in *dreams* or *visions* of the night. These in their nature wear the appearance of something transitory and brief, if not of something in a degree obscure. They do not seem to be appropriate for such a series of disclosures as John makes. It is not the mere fact, that Christianity will triumph over all opposition, and fill the world with the fruits of its victories, which John discloses. The development of successive and stirring events, is what he has also, in some degree, undertaken to make. Considered in this light, a mere passing dream or vision is not altogether appropriate, as a method of disclosure. The prophet, in the present case, falls into a waking holy ecstasy. He is at first overpowered by the magnificence and splendour of the scene before him. But being strengthened and encouraged, he resumes the use of all his powers. The *Christophany*, in chap i—iii, takes place in Patmos, on earth; but the succeeding visions are partly in heaven (4: 1 seq.), and partly on the seashore (12: 18 or 13: 1), and partly in the wilderness (17: 3 seq.). In the circumstance, that John in his ecstasy is rapt into the heavenly world, he stands alone. No prophet before was introduced to a similar scene, in such a way. Paul, indeed, was caught up into the third heaven; but he heard words "which it was not lawful to utter," 2 Cor. 12: 1 seq. John has uttered what he heard and saw.

There is something strikingly appropriate in all this. If John was to be fitted to disclose what was contained in the heavenly book which

was sealed with seven seals, then the contents of this book must be inspected in an appropriate manner, and in one different from that which was common in more ordinary disclosures. The tact of the writer, (if indeed this circumstance were to be attributed to tact), would exhibit itself here manifestly to great advantage. At all events, the whole thing is very appropriately conducted and represented. The apocryphal productions of the Ascension of Isaiah, and the fourth book of Ezra, the Book of Enoch, and also the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs (c. Levi), exhibit a similar rapture into heaven, copied, perhaps, more or less directly from the Apocalypse, or at any rate resulting from the taste which it had introduced, or fostered. Yet how faint are the impressions made upon the reader, by these latter works! How immeasurably inferior to the lofty and thrilling exhibitions proffered to our view by the Apocalyptist! Whoever doubts the superior illumination of John's mind, when he wrote the Revelation, will do well to read the apocryphal works in question, and make the comparison.

(4) Thus far we have compared the Apocalypse, as to its epistolary form, and as to the nature, frequency, and continuous series of its symbols, with the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament. We come now to another development respecting the form of this book, of a somewhat different nature. It has special respect to that part of the general idea of form, which concerns the *arrangement* of the contents, or the *order* in which the respective parts of composition are presented to us, and the relation in which they stand to each other and to a common principle of arrangement.

If I did not fear being taxed with an ambition to coin new words, I might call a prominent principle of arrangement throughout the Apocalypse, the principle of NUMEROSITY. I must even do this, at the risk of critical disapprobation. This word does not mean, as employed by me, that the book consists of many or numerous parts; for to designate this idea, one might speak of its *numerousness*, which is an old word. I do not mean moreover, by *numerosity*, to designate in this place the idea, that the book is composed in poetic measure, which is often called *numbers;* although it is in reality modelled, in some degree and through most of the work, after the Hebrew poetic parallelisms. What I wish to designate is simply this, viz., that the Apocalypse throughout, with scarcely any exception, is so arranged, that either the number 3, or else 7, 4, 10, 12, and (if parallelism be counted) 2, control its modes of development, i. e. the arrangement of its parts, greater and smaller, the grouping of its objects, the assignment of attributes to them, the epexegetical clauses, and the order of action main and subordinate. Above all, the number THREE stands conspicuous in the whole plan, in all its parts considerable or minute. Next to this stands the so-called sacred number *seven;*

then *four*, then *twelve*, and lastly *ten*. Parallelism, as exhibited in Hebrew poetry, not of the strictest kind but of that which is more free from rigid rule, reigns nearly everywhere. But I do not reckon this as a part of the *numerosity* of the book. All critics are now agreed, that the Apocalypse is *poetic* in its very genius and nature. It is not, indeed, in Greek or Latin measure. But it is substantially of the same nature with Hebrew poetry, as to its diction, its symbols, and the whole round of its ideas. Yet few, if any, have undertaken to trace even the evidences of Hebrew parallelism or stichometry in it; and almost none speak of its *numerosity*, with the exception of Ewald and Züllig, who have disclosed some small part of it.*

That parallelism for substance reigns almost everywhere, (some exceptions we may find in all prophecy, even in Isaiah), needs no other proof than an attentive perusal of the book by any one who is familiar with Hebrew poetry. The *disjecta membra poetae* are found on every side, and in every quarter. It would be superfluous to make a formal attempt to prove what lies open to noon-day inspection. Hereafter I shall, however, exhibit a few specimens of the usual parallelisms of the book. My present object is to produce evidence of the *numerosity* in question throughout the Apocalypse.

(a) Trichotomy, or tripartite divisions and groups, in the Apocalypse.

(1) The first and leading division of this nature, (which however is hardly artificial), is, (*a*) The Prologue, chap. i—iii. (*b*) The Visions or main body of the work, iv—xxii. 5. (*c*) The Epilogue, 22: 6—21. Each of these divisions exhibits trichotomy, moreover, in all its gradations, throughout its appropriate subdivisions.

* The first of these, only in a few cases toward the close of the book; the latter, more fully, but in many respects in a very inadequate and unsatisfactory way. Züllig's book I have not; but a copious review of it, (in Studien und Kritiken, 1842. Heft. III.), has given a disclosure of his views on the subject of numerosity. This I read, however, only after all my own views were formed, and published in part in a little pamphlet for the use of the class-room. Züllig, (Offenbarung Johannis, 2 vol. 8vo. 1834—40), has made *seven* the reigning number in the Apocalypse, and almost entirely overlooked the immeasurably greater predominance of *trichotomy*, i. e. tripartite division, and triplex grouping of objects. His views of the Apocalypse in general, I shall have occasion to speak of in the sequel. As it respects the subject of *numerosity*, the views which I develope originated entirely from often repeated study of the book, in order that I might write a commentary upon it. I have frequently reviewed them, and made some alterations and corrections. They are doubtless susceptible of still more, which would be to their improvement. But one mind cannot do everything at once, specially in such a great and complicated matter. At least, I feel that mine cannot. But the public will now have an opportunity to examine and judge, how far I am correct in these views respecting the numerosity of the Apocalypse which I now communicate.

(2) THE PROLOGUE. After the title of the book, (which is joined with a brief historical reference to its author and a commendation to the notice and study of the reader), follows, (*a*) The dedication of the work to the seven churches of Asia, 1: 4—8. (*b*) The Christophany, or manifestation of Jesus to John, 1: 9—20. (*c*) The epistles to the seven churches.

The portions *a* and *b* are too short, and too terse with descriptive matter, to permit of subdivision; but not so with the epistles. Each of the latter is divided into three parts; (*a*) A description of him who addresses the churches, by the mention of some of his attributes; 2: 1. 2: 8. 2: 12. 2: 18. 3: 1. 3: 7. 3: 14. (*b*) Disclosure of the characteristics of each church, with appropriate admonition or reproof; (in the sequel to each of the preceding texts quoted). (*c*) Each epistle closes with excitement to obedience, rendered more urgent and efficacious by promises of reward, or by threatenings. In these respects there is an entire uniformity through the whole of the epistles.

(3) THE VISIONS. In these, (iv—xxii. 5), there are three great *catastrophes*, to which all else has reference and is adjusted. (*a*) That of Sodom *spiritually* so-called, i. e. "the place where our Lord was crucified" or Jerusalem (11: 8), comprising chap. iv—xi. (*b*) That of mystic Babylon (Rome), chap. xii—xx. 3. (*c*) That of Gog and Magog, chap. 20: 4—10. Each of these catastrophes has a prologue or proem; (*a*) Chap. iv, v. (*b*) Chap. xii. (*c*) Chap. 20: 4—7, where the thousand years and the end of them stand as introductory to the loosing of Satan and the invasion of Gog and Magog.

In each of the catastrophes, (the last excepted), there are three *Morae* or *Episodes*, which contain various matters more or less connected with the main body of the Epopee, and which not only serve to introduce variety into the composition and increase the interest of it, as well as to deepen the impressions made upon the reader, but also to exhibit the long suffering of God in waiting for sinners to repent. Some of them, however, are devoted to strengthening the assurances, that the wicked will be punished and the righteous rewarded. *Episode* I name that which arrests the progress of the main action for any considerable time, and diverts our attention to something which is but indirectly connected with it. THE FIRST CATASTROPHE comprises three episodes; viz. (*a*) The sealing and safety of the 144,000 Jewish followers of the Lamb, chap. vii. (*b*) The appearance of an angel, who gives assurance of the speedy fall of the hostile power which wages war with the saints, and commissions John to utter new predictions, when the contents of the book with seven seals shall have all had their accomplishment, chap. x. (*c*) Preparation for the speedy consummation of the catastrophe, by guarding the most holy place against destruction,

(a symbol that all of Judaism but its real spirituality is to be destroyed), chap. 11: 1, 2; and also by the aggravated sins of persecutors against the two martyr-witnesses, who make their appearance in order to admonish and warn them, chap. 11: 3—14. THE SECOND CATASTROPHE also comprises three episodes; (*a*) Chap. xiv, which exhibits merely symbols and assurances of the safety of the church, and of the overthrow of the dragon, beast, and false prophet. (*b*) The explanatory interlude, in chap. xvii. (*c*) Renewed assurances of Babylon's utter ruin, and anticipated lament over her by various classes of persons, chap. xviii.

THE THIRD CATASTROPHE belongs to the *distant* future; and therefore, like all predictions of a similar nature in the Old Testament, is brief, 20: 4—10. Everything connected with such a future, in chap. xx—xxii, is also brief, with the single exception that the glories of the heavenly city are enlarged upon by the writer; most appropriately as it respects the encouragement which he designs to give to Christians under their disheartening circumstances. In such a case, i. e. when the whole of the third catastrophe, even if we include its prologue, in reality occupies only some *seven* verses, the usual trichotomy is necessarily excluded.

Before we dismiss the Episodes under consideration, let us, while our attention is directed to them, take a view of their internal arrangement. As to the first catastrophe, *the first episode* in it (chap. vii.) may be distinguished into three several parts; (*a*) Preparation for sealing the servants of God, 7: 1—3. (*b*) The sealing with the enumeration of those to whom it was extended, 7: 4—8. (*c*) Rejoicing in heaven, with thanksgiving, consequent upon this transaction, 7: 9—17. *The second episode* (chap. x.) might be thus divided; (*a*) The appearance of an angel, with solemn assurances and tokens that the persecuting enemy are speedily to be destroyed, and thus the predictions of the book with seven seals to be accomplished, 10: 1—7. (*b*) John is furnished by the angel with a new book, for the sake of further development, and commanded to eat it, i. e. eagerly to devour its contents, 10: 8—10. (*c*) A new commission to continue his prophesying, and extend it to the great multitude of nations, is given him. (Here *πάλιν προφητεῦσαι* (10: 11) shows, that the contents of the sealed book would be exhausted by the seventh trumpet). In this case, however, the trichotomy is less palpable than usual. *The third episode* (11: 1—13) discloses the determination to preserve the most holy and spiritual part of the ancient worship, notwithstanding the wasting of Judea and Jerusalem; and that the destruction about to take place, will be greatly aggravated by the persecution of faithful witnesses. It is divided thus: (*a*) Chap. 11: 1, 2, contains the directions for preserving the best part of Judaism. (*b*) The persecution, death, and resurrection, of the two witnesses, 11: 3—12. (*c*) The manifestation

of further divine displeasure, with threatening of speedy and final destruction, 11: 13, 14.

The episodes in the *second* catastrophe are still more definitely *trichotomized.* The *first* (ch. xiv.) exhibits, (*a*) The Lamb, with the 144,000 who had been sealed and saved under the first catastrophe, (comp. chap. vii.) The whole spectacle is a visible and significant emblem and assurance of Christ's power to save. The joy of the Saviour in his faithful followers, and their notes of praise and thanksgiving, are combined with the symbol, 14: 1—5. (*b*) Three angels successively appear, and make *proclamation*, first, of the universal spread of the gospel; then of the fall of Babylon; and thirdly, of the punishment of those who belong to her, 14: 6—12. A voice from heaven sanctions this, by assurance of the happiness secured to the righteous, 14: 13. (*c*) *Symbols* are employed, in the third portion of chap. xiv, in order to express with still greater intensity the assurance of the destruction of Babylon. In the exhibition of these, three angels are successively introduced, 14: 14—20. The three angels are mentioned in vs. 15, 17, 18. The ὅμοιος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, in v. 14, is doubtless the Saviour himself; comp. Dan. 7: 13. In the *second episode* (chap. xvii.), we find, (*a*) Occurrences and phenomena preparatory to the disclosure about to be made, 17: 1—6. (*b*) Description of the beast with seven heads and ten horns, 17: 7—14. (*c*) Of the woman sitting over many waters, 17: 15—18. The *third episode* (chap. xviii.) exhibits several trichotomies; viz. (*a*) Assurances of final and irremediable destruction to Babylon, so that all the people of God are warned to remove far from her, 18: 1—8. (*b*) Exhibition of the lamentation about to be sung over her, 18: 9—20. (*c*) A striking and final symbol of her speedy and remediless overthrow, 18: 21—24. The second member of this trichotomy, viz. the lamentation, is again subdivided thus: (*a*) Lamentation by allied kings and princes, 18: 9, 10. (*b*) By traders and merchants, 18: 11—16. (*c*) By seamen and ship-owners, 18: 17—19; to which the author adds an epiphonema of an opposite character, on the part of the redeemed, 18: 20. In each of the three parts, οὐαί! οὐαί! ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, is repeated. In each, the closing sentence says: "In one hour thy desolation has come," or uses words of the same import.

It is worthy of special remark here, also, that in the first and second catastrophes, *two* episodes immediately precede the final consummation; e. g. in chap. x. xi, and in chap. xvii. xviii. The true nature of the economy of the book cannot be seen in its proper light, without a careful examination of all these adjustments and mutual relations of the author's plan. Not only the unity of the piece is demonstrated by such an arrangement, but the nature and progress of the action in the Epopee are very significantly developed. The question, whether there is more

than one catastrophe, seems to be decided by the nature of the plan. As to the *third* catastrophe, the brevity which the author adopts, precludes all artificial arrangement.

Having completed our view of the episodes, let us now go back to the *main action* of the piece.

In the arrangement of this, the number *seven* is, if I may so express it, the presiding genius. E. g. we have seven seals, seven trumpets with their angels, and seven vials with their angels. Of course, so far as this number has control, *trichotomy* must be either excluded, or be subordinate. The latter of these takes place. In each of the *sevens*, the author makes two divisions; first a *tetrachotomy*, i. e. a division into four parts, and secondly a *trichotomy*, which comprises the remaining three. To each of these groups is assigned its distinctive phenomena; as we shall see hereafter.

Relinquishing, at present, the further notice of the groups of sevens and fours, we will follow the number *three*, through the parts of the main action. The episodes have been already examined.

In the triplex group which is constituted by the last three of each of the *heptades* or divisions by seven, we find, in nearly if not quite all the cases, distinct and marked peculiarities. For example; in 6: 9 seq., (where the fifth seal commences), there is plainly an entire new turn of thought. The first four seals (6: 1—8) develope the formation of the dreadful array commissioned against the persecuting power. All belongs most plainly to the constitution of one great army. But in the group of *three* which follows, there is a regular and constant accession to the action of the main plot. The martyrs point to their blood, and call for vengeance. At the opening of the sixth seal, all heaven is roused and prepares for the condign punishment of persecutors. Then comes the episode (chap. vii.), which shows how the innocent will be put in a state of safety. We then naturally expect the consummation; for so did all heaven, while they stood in awful silence, 8: 1. But the seventh seal disparts, and divides the consummation into seven stages, signalized by as many trumpets. Here again we have tetrachotomy and trichotomy. The first group of four has reference to plagues that principally concern the state of the earth; which is divided into land, sea, rivers and fountains, and the welkin above, making the contour of the visible creation. The remaining group of three successively developes the locusts, the horsemen from the Euphrates, and (after the episodes in x. xi.), the final tremendous assault by thunder, lightning, hail, and earthquake; viii—xi. We have yet a *third* series of sevens, in chap. xv. xvi.; (a circumstance in the arrangement which must not be forgotten). Here is the like division into groups of four and three. The first four vials have respect to the various portions of the world, viz. the earth,

the sea, the rivers and fountains, and the ruling planet of the welkin above. Then comes, with the last three, more direct attacks upon persecutors, 16: 10—21. The seat of the beast is affected; the Euphrates is dried up, in order to make a way for foreign invaders; and finally the air is so affected by the seventh vial, that lightnings, thunders, and destructive hail follow, and an earthquake shatters the capital of the persecuting power.

From this review of the *three* series of sevens in the book, it is plain that trichotomy, although it here acts a secondary, still acts a very conspicuous, part. The consummation of the catastrophes in each case, is marked by trichotomy, and exhibits the most intense and destructive measures on the part of the great Conqueror.

It remains still, that we take a view of the *prologues* or *proems* which stand before those groups of seven which indicate directly an advancement in the main action. Chap. iv. v. constitute the first proem; and one, I may add, of great solemnity and exquisite beauty and majesty. Each of these chapters will be found, by minute investigation, to be capable of a division by trichotomy; e. g. 4: 2, 3, the divine majesty; 4: 4—7, the attendant ministers around the throne of God; 4: 8—11, the symphony of praise or worship. So in chap. v, the trichotomy is marked by *καὶ εἶδον*, vs. 1, 6, 9; in the first instance only is this phrase repeated for the sake of emphasis. But as these divisions are not strongly marked, and slide easily and naturally into each other, I will not insist on them in this initial proem.

The proem before the action under the seventh seal (8: 3—5), is very short; for here the action is not to be immediately consummated. In like manner the proem before the last woe-trumpet (11: 15—18) is short; for two long episodes have just preceded.

As at the commencement of the first catastrophe, the proem is long and very striking and solemn, (ch. iv. v.), so is it in the introduction to the second catastrophe. As in the first, the theophany, the sealed book, the Lamb, the attendant and reverent living creatures, elders, and angels, excite the mind to high expectations in regard to the sequel; so in the second, (as the former scenes will not bear repetition), a different but exalted theme is introduced, viz., the incarnation of Christ, the malignant efforts of Satan to destroy him, the defeat and degradation of this enemy, and his consequent determination to seek revenge. All this prepares the reader for a deep interest in the sequel; which is not disappointed. This second principal proem is almost as long as the first; and immediately after this, the main action in the second catastrophe commences, and persecution and heathenism move furiously on.—But we are now concerned only with the trichotomy of the prologue. This is quite plain; (*a*) The appearance, technogony, and dangers of the

woman clothed with the sun, and of her offspring, 12: 1—6. (*b*) The war of Michael and his angels against the devil and his angels, in order to repel the assaults of Satan, 12: 7—12. (*c*) The vindictive rage and malice of Satan on account of his defeat, and his determination to persecute the church, 12: 13—17.

Before the consummation of the second catastrophe begins its final movement, stands another prologue, serving merely to mark preparation for the onset, chap. xv. This may be subdivided into (*a*) The presentation of the scenery appropriate to the occasion, 15: 1, 2. (*b*) The song of anticipated victory, 15: 3, 4. (*c*) The commission of the seven angels, charged to commence the work of overthrow, 15: 5—8.

Chap. xvi. exhibits the pouring out of all the seven vials, without any delay or interposition. For this mode of proceeding the author seems to have had good reason. The destruction of great Babylon, and of the beast and false prophet, is not absolute and final. The idea seems to have been, in the mind of the writer, that a country so almost boundless as the Roman empire, could not, with any manifest probability, be supposed to be destroyed merely by shattering its great capital and other large cities. The contest with the beast and false prophet would be of longer duration than that under the first catastrophe, where the destruction of the great capital of a small country would involve the whole country in ruin. Accordingly, in chap. xviii. xix. we find the contest still continued, and finally completed. Since now the Roman empire is the chosen symbol of the second hostile power, and of its wide domain, has not the writer displayed great tact in the proprieties with which he conducts, continues, and finally ends the contest? And if the persecution of Christians by Pagans be symbolized by all this, surely there is great propriety in not closing it by one great blow, like that in the first catastrophe, 11: 15—19. If, moreover, there be a good foundation for what I have now said, then the reason is apparent, why *prologue* should be here omitted before the seventh vial. In reality the contest is *finished* in chap. 19: 11 seq., and before this final scene, we have a prologue as usual. But in chap. xvi, while the great and decisive blow is struck, at the pouring out of the last vial which makes a kind of catastrophe, yet still it is not a wholly completed one.

In the proem in chap. xix, there are three divisions: (*a*) The shout of anticipated victory, with praise to God on account of it, 19: 1—4. (*b*) A renewal, by divine command, of the same, 19: 5—8. (*c*) Assurances of the final happiness of saints and martyrs, 19: 9, 10. During the first shouts of praise, ἀλληλούϊα occurs three times.

Thus much for the *prologues* as connected with the main action or the catastrophes. We have already seen, that the third and last catastrophe of necessity dispenses with them.

In regard to the final action in the second catastrophe, it remains to be noticed, that here also is the usual trichotomy. (*a*) The marching forth of the great Captain of salvation with his army, 19: 11—16. (*b*) Invitation to all the ravenous beasts and birds to come to the approaching slaughter, 19: 17, 18. (*c*) Final overthrow and destruction of the enemy, 19: 19—21. Or rather, as Satan is leagued with this enemy, this portion should include also chap. 20: 1—3, for this indicates his punishment, as well as that of the beast and false prophet, all of whom were leagued together.

The third catastrophe, with its proem, 20: 4—10, as has been remarked, excludes trichotomy by its brevity. Yet the whole may be divided into proem, the victory over Gog and Magog, and the *final* punishment of Satan. The sequel of the book is rather an epiphonema than a part of the regular drama or Epopee; and yet, so exquisitely is it imagined and adapted to the writer's purpose, that we should as willingly part with any portion of the book as with this. By no part of it has the author presented higher moral excitement to his readers, than by this. Indeed we should feel his plan in a measure to be incomplete without it.

The remainder of the book, 20: 11—22: 5, exhibits, (*a*) The final resurrection and judgment, 20: 11—13. (*b*) Hell, 20: 14, 15. (*c*) Heaven, 21: 1—22: 5. On the appropriateness of enlarging on this last topic, I have already remarked, (p. 133 above.)

The epilogue, 22: 6—20, consists, (*a*) Of the address of the angel to John, 22: 6—11. (*b*) The declarations of the Saviour respecting the things predicted and the promises made, 22: 12—17. (*c*) The solemn assurances of the writer of the book respecting the sacred and inviolable contents of it, 22: 18—20. The whole concludes with a benediction.

Thus have we followed *trichotomy* through all parts of the book, from the beginning to the end. The indelible stamp of one and the same hand is on every part of the production. But all which has thus far been exhibited, has reference only to larger portions of the book, containing one or more paragraphs. We might stop with this as being sufficient for our present purpose; *but in this place it will be most convenient and proper to pursue the investigation of these trichotomies, as exhibited in particular phrases and groups of objects, in all parts of the book.*

I shall present but few of these *in extenso*, limiting myself in this respect merely to such as will serve for specimens of all the rest. The only way in which the reader can satisfy himself, therefore, as to the great mass of these minor trichotomies, will be to open his Greek Testament, and follow through the references which I shall give him.

Chap. 1: 4, (in the description of God), *ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*. In 1: 4, 5, grace and peace are desired from the *ὁ ὤν*, from the seven spirits, and from Jesus Christ. In 1: 5, three attributives are assigned to Jesus Christ. In 1: 5, 6, three things are mentioned which he has done for us. 1: 8, three groups of attributives are assigned to God, one of which is subdivided into three. 1: 17, three attributes ascribed to Christ, *ὁ πρῶτος, ὁ ἔσχατος, ὁ ζῶν*, (plainly belonging together). 1: 19, write three things; (but perhaps *ἃ εἰσί* means, *what they signify*, which would destroy the trichotomy.)

Chap. 2: 2, two groups of three each. 2: 3, three things done. 2: 5, three to be done. 2: 9, three members in the epexegesis of *ἔργα*, (cases like this often occur). 2: 14, Balaam did three things. 2: 20, Jezabel does three things.

Chap. 3: 5, three parts in the reward. 3: 7, three different actions ascribed to Christ. 3: 8, three good qualities of the church at Philadelphia. 3: 9, the false Jews will be made to do three things. 3: 12, three names to be written upon him who conquers. 3: 14, three in the group of attributives ascribed to Christ. 3: 17, three things which the church says of itself. 3: 18, three things which the church must do.

Chap: 4: 4, three predicates of the twenty-four elders. 4: 5, lightnings, voices, thunders, issue from the throne. 4: 8, three things predicated of the four living creatures—*ἅγιος* thrice repeated—three appellations of God—three attributes ascribed to him; (making four groups of three in one verse). 4: 9, glory, honour, thanksgiving. 4: 10, the twenty-four elders do three things. 4: 11, glory, honour, power.

Chap. 5: 3, heaven, earth, underworld. 5: 5, three designations of Christ. 5: 6, in the midst of three things. 5: 11, round about three things.

Chap. 6: 2, three things ascribed to the conqueror. 6: 6, three things attending the development of the third seal. 6: 12—14, two groups of three each, the consequences of the opening of the sixth seal. The second group, in verses 13, 14, is more composite than the first, inasmuch as it comprises two comparisons for illustration.

Chap. 7: 1, three things on which the wind is not to blow. 7: 3, the same. 7: 11, angels standing round three things. 7: 16, three evils which the redeemed shall not suffer. 7: 17, three things which God and the Lamb shall do for them.

Chap. 8: 5, three things which the angel did. 8: 7, three things which took place—one third of the earth burned up, in three different respects. 8: 8, one third of the sea; and the like twice in verse 9, and so in verse 10, 11, and 12, (five times in the last). 8: 13, three woes—three angels to sound the last three woe-trumpets.

Chap. 9: 4, three things not to be hurt. 9: 15, one third part of men. 9: 17, three things predicated of the horsemen—also fire, smoke, and

brimstone, from the mouths of the horses. 9: 18, three plagues destroy one third part of men—by fire, smoke, and brimstone. 9: 20, twice three predicates of *εἴδωλα*.

Chap. 10: 1, twice three predicates of the angel. 10: 6, God created three things.

Chap. 11: 1, John ordered to measure three things. 11: 6, witnesses can do three things. 11: 7, the beast will do three things. 11: 10, the enemies of the witnesses will do three things. 11: 17, three attributives of God. 11: 18, two groups of three each who are to be rewarded, viz. servants, prophets, saints, and *φοβούμενοι, μικροί, μέγαλοι*—three things to be done, to judge, to give to his saints, to destroy the wicked.

Chap. 12: 1, three attributives of the woman. 12: 4, a third part of the stars. 12: 9, the dragon is serpent, devil, and satan. 12: 10, salvation, power, and reign of God. 12: 16, the earth did three things.

Chap. 13: 2, beast like to a panther, a bear, and a lion—the dragon gives him three things. 13: 6, to blaspheme three things. V. 7, power to do three things. 13: 16, three groups of antithetic or discrepant classes of men.

Chap. 14: 2, voice from heaven like three things. 14: 3, new song in presence of three things. 14: 4, three predicates of the redeemed. 14: 7, do homage to God in three ways. 14: 19, the angel did three things.

Chap. 15: 2, the martyrs are conquerors over three things.

Chap. 16: 13, three unclean spirits out of the mouth of three different beings. 16: 18, lightnings, voices, thunders, to be grouped together. 16: 19, Babylon cleft into three parts—cup of three qualifications to be given her.

Chap. 17: 3, three attributives of the woman. 17: 4, three more attributives. 17: 8, two groups of attributives, each three. 17: 11, three more, in like manner. 17: 14, invited, select, faithful. 17: 17, God has inclined them to do three things.

Chap. 18: 2, Babylon has become three things. 18: 6, do three things to Babylon. 18: 7, Babylon claims to be three things. 18: 8, death, mourning, famine, are to be grouped together. 18: 16, clothed with three things—adorned with three. 18: 20, three classes of persons who are to rejoice.

Chap. 19: 1, salvation, glory, power. 19: 7, let us do three things. 19: 18, two groups of three each, whose flesh is to be eaten, (the last group bi-membral). 19: 19, three gathered together to make war.

Chap. 21: 1, three things have passed away. 21: 4, one leading group of three, and one subordinate one. 21: 13, four times three gates. 21: 15, measure three things. 21: 16, length, breadth, height.

Chap. 22: 13, three groups of divine predicates. 22: 15, two groups

of three. 22: 16, root-shoot, offspring, morning-star. 22: 17, three classes invited to respond and accept the offer made.

It is now time to make some remarks on these striking phenomena. Not that *trichotomy* is the only kind of *numerosity* which belongs to the Apocalypse; for, as we shall see in the sequel, *seven*, *four*, *twelve*, and *ten*, all have their respective claims. Yet the influence of these is far inferior to the all-pervading influence of trichotomy, or triplicity of grouping.

But whence these multiform and everywhere abounding *triplicities* in the Apocalypse? Was John deeply imbued, as not a few have asserted, with the Cabbalistic art of making out the significancy of words by various modes of combining the numbers, which the letters of those words might designate? That John attached meaning, and even by no means unimportant significancy, to his triads, heptades, tetrades, and in some few cases decades and duodecades, I am not about to deny, for how can it be denied by any one who has minutely analyzed and scanned the Apocalypse? But with the single exception of chap. 13: 18, (the number of the beast which is 666), he has made no near approach to the mystical use of numbers by the Cabbalists; and even there, as we shall see in due time, he has not followed so much the Cabbalists, as a prevailing fashion of the day.* There is no certain evidence, nor (as it seems to me) any evidence even probable, that the Cabbalism of the Rabbins had advanced beyond the mere germ, when the Revelation was written. At all events, the manner in which John introduces his groups, either in the larger or smaller parts of his work, in conformity with the principles of *numerosity*, is something very different from the *Gematria* of Cabbalism, as exhibited in the note below.

In the New Testament there is plainly nothing elsewhere, which re-

* The Cabbalists practised the interpretation of Scriptures by the use of numbers, in three different ways: (1) By *Gematria* (גֵּמַטְרִיָא, *γεωμετρία?*), which means a computation of the numerical value of letters in one or more words; and then the application of the same number to another word which is equivalent, i. e. of the same numerical value. E. g. Gen. 49: 10, יָבוֹא שִׁילֹה, *Shiloh will come* = 358 in numerical value; and מָשִׁיחַ designates the same number; therefore, *Shiloh will come* means the *Messiah*. (2) *Notarikon* (נוֹטַרִיקוֹן), in which single letters of a particular word, or of different words, are made significant or the representatives of other entire words; e. g. Gen. 1: 1, בָּרָא may be considered as designating אָב, רוּחַ, בֵּן, (Son, Spirit, Father); and consequently בָּרָא points us to the doctrine of the Trinity. (3) *Temura* (טְמוּרָא concealment) indicates an arbitrary transposition of the letters of any word so as to constitute another and different word; e. g. Gen. 1: 1, בְּרֵאשִׁית transposed makes בְּתִישְׁרֵא, i. e. the month *Tishri*, or September; which shows that the world was created in that month!! I need not say to the intelligent and observing reader, that there is nothing in all the Apocalypse which has any resemblance to either of these extravagant conceits.

sembles in any considerable degree this trichotomy of the Apocalypse. But did not John find his exemplar in the Old Testament? I hesitate not to believe that he did. And this can be easily pointed out.

In all the Old Testament there is but one extended piece, which we can properly name an *Epic* or *Epopee*. That the book of Job constitutes a poem of this nature, cannot well be denied. It exhibits the essential features of an Epopee; not of a character bellicose and highly romantic by reason of adventures, like the Iliad and Aeneid, but of a character moral and didactic, mingled indeed with incidents of a deeply interesting nature. It has action—progressive action, and as much unity as belongs to other epics. Its poetic fancy and spirit have never been exceeded—might I not say, have scarcely if ever been equalled? And he, who would dispute against the application of the title *Epopee* to it, would only busy himself with logomachies. A very circumscribed definition of Epopee, might exclude the book of Job from a claim to this title; but what obliges us to regard the limits of the word as being so narrow?

In Ps. xviii, in Is. xiii. xiv, and also in Hab. iii, we have a kind of miniature Epopee. But an *epinikion* or *triumphal song* is in reality the proper title of each of these; for it describes them with sufficient accuracy. They differ much from the plan of the book of Job or of the Apocalypse.

All the leading characteristics which have just been ascribed to the book of Job, belong also to the Apocalypse. It is in its very nature *poetical*. It has a unity of main design. It exhibits rapid, varied, and wonderful action. It celebrates, indeed, not the triumphs of an Achilles, an Aeneas, or a Tancred, but the triumphs of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. It is not the sacking of Ilium, nor the subjugation of an Italian province—nor merely the taking of Jerusalem, which is described, but the conquest of a world, and the complete subjugation of all the powers of darkness. It approaches much nearer than the book of Job, to the usual characteristics of a proper Epopee.

I have been obliged in some measure to digress, in order to prepare the way for the sequel of my remarks on the form of the Apocalypse in respect to trichotomy. As Job is the Epic of the Old Testament, and the only one, so is the Apocalypse the Epic and the only one of the New. Are these two works, now, which in this general respect have the like character, similar to each other in regard to *trichotomy?*

To answer this question, it becomes necessary briefly to point out the same peculiarity in the book of Job; and this may be easily done.

The first grand division of it is into (*a*) Prologue. (*b*) The poem proper. (*c*) Epilogue. Then (I.) The prologue is subdivided into accounts, (*a*) Of Job's prosperity. (*b*) Of his losses. (*c*) Of his sickness

and trials. Then (II.) The poem proper is divided into three leading parts; (*a*) The dispute of Job with his friends. (*b*) The address of Elihu, who proffers himself as umpire. (*c*) The closing address of Jehovah. Next, as to subordinate *triplicities*, we are presented with three friends who come to console Job. These address him three times each, (with only one exception, which will be noticed in the sequel). To each of them he makes three replies, (abating one in relation to the exception noted). Finally, Job's closing speeches are divided into three, chap. xxvi—xxxi. As a substitute for Zophar's third speech, Elihu breaks in, through his impatience, and makes an address; and then he makes three speeches for himself; chap. xxxii—xxxvii. It would seem, moreover, to lie upon the face of the whole matter, that the dispute was carried on for three days, the three friends each once addressing Job on each day, and Job making three replies. Last of all, God himself interposes, and makes three addresses to Job and his friends; chap. xxxviii —xli. The epilogue closes the piece; which consists, (*a*) Of Job's justification. (*b*) Of his reconciliation with his friends. (*c*) Of his final prosperity.

If now we look away from these trichotomies, which lie upon the face of the book in general, and turn our attention to the individual addresses of each speaker, we may easily find, in most of them, a triplex division of contents. To begin with the first complaint of Job; (*a*) The day of his birth is beshrewed, 3: 1—10. (*b*) Earnest wishes that he had perished in the womb, 3: 10—19. (*c*) Remonstrance against giving existence to the wretched, 3: 20—26. So in the speech of Eliphaz; (*a*) Gentle remonstrance against the excessive grief of Job, 4: 1—5. (*b*) Intimations that the innocent are never involved in such calamities, 4: 6—11. (*c*) A vision in confirmation of this sentiment, 4: 12—21. And thus it is in many, or rather, in most of the speeches. In some, however, either the brevity or the nature of the subject, or both, do not admit trichotomy. Below this *trichotomy of paragraphs*, so to speak, we seldom find triplicity in individual expressions. The rigid adherence to *parallelism*, in the book of Job, necessarily excluded them. But not so in the Apocalypse; for we have seen, that from the beginning to the end it is full of *triplex* individual groups.*

If it be said: All this is too *artificial* for us to think of applying it to a book so sacred as the Scriptures; the answer is not difficult. Artificial arrangement is not wanting in many parts of the Old Testament, nor in some parts of the New, besides the Apocalypse. For example;

* In respect to the trichotomy of the book of Job, I must acknowledge my obligation in part to the recent work of Koester upon this book. In the preface to this work, the writer has disclosed his views in regard to triplicity; but he takes no notice of the Apocalypse in this respect.

we have no less than seven *alphabetic* Psalms, i. e. Psalms in which each line begins with a successive letter of the Alphabet in order, viz. Ps. xxv. xxxiv. xxxvii. cxi. cxii. cxix. cxlv. Psalm cxix. has added much to the artificial arrangement which prevails in the others, for in this longest of all the Psalms, each letter of the alphabet introduces a continuous series of eight verses, each line of which begins with the same letter. Hence the names of the sections, *Aleph*, *Beth*, etc. In Prov. 31: 10 seq., there is another alphabetic composition, like the usual Psalms of this character. In the book of Lamentations, the whole composition is of this character. Chap. i. ii. iv. v. resemble in manner the usual alphabetic Psalms; while chap. iii. exhibits three successive lines each beginning with the same letter, and so through the alphabet, making sixty-six verses, instead of twenty-two as in the others. Here the number *three* acts, of course, a conspicuous part.

In the New Testament we have the genealogy of Matthew divided into *three* series of twice seven, i. e. fourteen. Peter's vision, in Acts x, was thrice repeated; Peter denied Christ thrice; Paul besought the Lord thrice; the master of the barren fig-tree came three years seeking fruit, Luke 13: 7; a woman hid leaven in three measures of meal, Matt. 13: 33; and so *three score* is often employed. These examples, however, constitute a mere reference to a thing which is widely diffused. But I need not exhibit, here, what every Concordance will easily supply.

Whatever now may be the ground or reason of all these *triplicities*, the FACT itself is one which admits of no question. I will concede, for the sake of discussion, that some of the trichotomies which I have pointed out in the Apocalypse or in Job, may not stand the test of thorough scrutiny, and that there is even something of the fanciful on my part in them. Yet the most rigid scrutiny cannot detect anything of this nature, in respect to the mass of them. They are so plain and palpable, they lie so upon the very surface of the composition, that candour can do no less than admit them.

The explanation or vindication of such a usage, both in the Old Testament and in the New, would be aside from our present object, which is merely to exhibit an account of the actual form and arrangement of the Apocalypse. That part of the subject which relates to the *significancy* of the number three, and also of the other numbers which perform a conspicuous part in the Apocalypse, must be reserved for the Commentary on particular passages, and the Excursus connected with it.

(*b*) Heptades, or divisions by seven, in the Apocalypse.

Beyond all question, next after three the number *seven* makes the most conspicuous figure in the book before us. I must therefore briefly exhibit its use, by the writer of this book.

I. *In the larger divisions of the work.*

(*a*) In the prologue, the seven epistles to the seven churches. (*b*) In the main body of the work; (1) The seven seals; the breaking of which corresponds to seven series of events, chap. v. seq. (2) The seven trumpets, which grow out of the seventh seal; which correspond to a like series of final events in the first catastrophe, chap. viii. seq. (3) In the second catastrophe we have the seven vials of the wrath of God, corresponding to the like series of plagues. To the trumpets and the vials are assigned seven angels, one respectively for each of them. (*c*) The epilogue is too short to admit of heptades.

II. *In the smaller divisions of the work and particular groups of persons or objects.*

Chap. 1: 4, the seven spirits before the throne. This idea is repeated, or a similar one, in 4: 5. 5: 6. 8: 2. 15: 1, 6. 16: 1. 17: 1. In 5: 6, to the Lamb are ascribed seven horns and seven eyes. Seven churches are addressed in 1: 4, 11, and virtually in the inscriptions to the seven epistles, ii. seq. Chap. 1: 12, seven lamps, and so in 4: 5. In 1: 16, seven stars. In 5: 12, seven attributives of God. In 6: 15, seven classes of persons. 7: 12, (as before) seven attributives of God. 8: 3, seven trumpets. 10: 3, 4, seven thunders. 11: 13, seven thousand men perish. 12: 3, the dragon has seven heads. 13: 1, the beast with seven heads. 15: 8. 16: 1, seven angels with seven vials. 17: 9, 10, seven heads signify seven mountains and seven kings. 18: 13, seven groups of objects here. 21: 9, seven angels, seven vials, seven last plagues.

It will be seen by this view of the *heptades* in the Apocalypse, that, although they act an important part, and are employed in the grouping of the greatest events and of the most considerable actors and things, yet, on the whole, they are greatly inferior in respect to their frequency to the *triads* which we have already examined. One needs, moreover, merely to take up a Concordance of the Old Testament, in order to learn what a conspicuous part the number *seven* everywhere acts in the Hebrew Scriptures. The idea of *fulness* or *completion*, designated by seven symbolically employed, lies doubtless at the foundation of this usage. But of this, more in another place.

Finally, as to the three and a half years, or its equivalent, forty-two months or 1260 days, (11: 3, 9, 11. 12: 6, 14. 13: 5), they would seem, at first view, to have their origin in the same period as developed in the book of Daniel (7: 25. 12: 7); but in reality they probably are derived from mere historical facts, rather than from any special symbolical signification. I cannot regard them as employed tropically, merely because they are *the half of seven.*

(*c*) Tetrades, or groups of fours.

The larger divisions of the Apocalypse are not anywhere adjusted by this number. It appears in but few cases, except in individual groupings. In three cases, however, it acts a part somewhat conspicuous; i. e. in the subdivisions of the seven seals, and the trumpets, and vials. As these sevens are subdivided into two groups of four and three, in some important respects distinct from each other, so the number four is here concerned with a species of division in discourse. Elsewhere *four* serves to denote *an enlarged entirety of group*. To explain the ground of this symbolical meaning, belongs, as in the cases above, to the sequel of this work.

The detail amounts to considerable. It first appears in the epexegesis of ἔργα, in 2: 19, viz. love, faith, ministry, patience. In 4: 6. 19: 4, four living creatures uphold the throne of divine Majesty. 5: 9, tribe, tongue, people, nation. 5: 13, heaven, earth, underworld, sea—blessing, honour, glory, power. 7: 1, four angels—four corners of the earth—four winds. 7: 9, nation, tribe, people, tongue. 8: 5, voices, thunder, lightning, earthquake. 8: 7, 9, 10, 12, four trumpets affect earth, sea, rivers and fountains of water, and the sky above. 10: 11, prophesy before people, nations, tongues, kings. 11: 9, as in 7: 9 above. 12: 9, four groups of names for Satan. 12: 19, salvation, might, kingdom, authority. 13: 7, as in 7: 9 above. 14: 6, the same. 14: 7, heaven, earth, sea, fountains. 17: 15, people, multitudes, nations, tongues. 17: 6, the ten horns and the beast will do four things to the harlot. 18: 12, four groups of Genitives following γόμον—four of the like following σκεῦος. 18: 22, four classes of musicians. 21: 8, four groups of evil-doers to be punished.

That *four* or a *tetrade* is symbolical of *enlarged completeness*, can hardly escape the notice of any one who attentively peruses the passages to which reference has just been made. That this number was among the favorite ones of the author, is sufficiently clear from the frequency with which it is employed.

(*d*) Duodecades, or groups of twelve.

These are not very frequent; and the reason for their being employed, in any case, seems to have an evident relation to the *twelve tribes* of Israel. E. g. the twelve times twelve thousand sealed on their foreheads, 7: 4. So in 7: 5—8, the twelve thousand chosen out of each tribe. 14: 1, 3, mentions the same number. With reference to the twelve tribes, we find the new Jerusalem having twelve foundation-rows of precious stones, with the twelve apostles' names on them, 21: 14. In 21: 16, the compass of the new city is twelve thousand furlongs. 21: 21, the twelve gates consist of twelve pearls. 22: 2, twelve fruit-harvests in a year.

(*e*) Decades, or groups of tens.

These are so few, that one can hardly put them to the account of special design. E. g. 11: 13, the tenth part of the city fell. 12: 3, the dragon with ten horns. 13: 1, the beast with the same. The latter is brought to view again, in 17: 12, 16. In both cases, the model is to be found in Dan. 7: 7 seq.

That *ten* is employed as a large, round, and complete number, having a peculiar roundness and significancy among all the groups of numbers, is sufficiently plain. The idea which it conveys, with its significancy as symbol, seems to have been taken from the divisions of the hands and feet. We might perhaps say, that it is apparently employed in the Apocalypse for the sake of *variety* in symbol, rather than from any necessity.

(*f*) Parallelisms of the Apocalypse.

There remains only one topic more of this nature; and this has respect to the *duads*, i. e. the *δίστιχοι* or bimembral divisions of the Apocalypse.

Every one acquainted with Hebrew poetry, knows well that parallelism or bimembral divisions constitute its most prominent feature. Next to this stand lofty, select, figurative language, frequency of metaphor, and allegorical representations. I will not say, that the diction in the Apocalypse is in general as lofty and select as that of Isaiah; but I may truly say, that in frequency of metaphorical and figurative expression, and in the use of symbols, it exceeds any and all of the Hebrew prophets. The world of imagery in which it lives and moves, has no complete parallel in the Scriptures.

Its poetic element, therefore, will not be disputed. But as to its *form*—it has not indeed any claim to the feet or measure of heroic verse in the Greek or Roman classics. But it has everywhere more or less of the Hebrew parallelism thrown into its sentences. The writer, however, does not seem to have aimed at this, as a special object to which he had directed peculiar attention. As a Hebrew, and thoroughly imbued as he certainly was with a knowledge of the Hebrew prophets, (who for the most part are also *poets*), he has fallen, times without number, into a rythmus like that which they exhibit.

I pass by the seven epistles in the prologue to the book, because, although many parallelisms might easily be produced from them, yet this species of writing does not so naturally demand rythmus, as the main body of the work. The first opening of the latter affords specimens of John's usual manner. Chap. 4: 2 seq. runs thus:

And straightway I was in the spirit,
And lo! a throne was set in heaven,
And one was sitting upon the throne,
And he who sat resembled a jasper and a sardius,
And a rainbow round the throne was like an emerald,
And round the throne were four and twenty thrones,
And on the thrones sat four and twenty elders,
Being girt around with vestures of white,
And on their heads were golden crowns.

So again in the closing part of the first prelude:

And they sang a new song, saying:
Worthy art thou to take the book and open its seals,
For thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood,
Out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,
And hast made us kings and priests to God,
And we shall reign upon the earth.

In the description of the 144,000, who had been sealed, 7: 14 seq., we find the following passage:

These are they who come out of great distress,
Who have washed and cleansed their robes in the Lamb's blood.
Because of this they are before God's throne,
And day and night they serve him in his temple,
And he who sitteth on the throne will pitch his tent over them,
They shall not hunger, neither shall they thirst,
Nor sun nor burning heat shall fall upon them,
For the Lamb on the midst of the throne shall feed them,
He shall lead them to fountains of living water,
And God shall wipe all tears from off their eyes.

So in 11: 17 seq.

We thank thee Lord God almighty, who art and wast,
That thou hast taken thy mighty power and dost reign,
The nations indeed were angry, but thine anger came,
The appointed time for the dead, to judge, and give reward
To thy servants, the prophets and the saints,
To those who fear thy name, both small and great,
And to destroy those who lay waste the land.

One more passage must suffice, 18: 4 seq.

Come out of her, my people,
That ye may not be made partakers of her sins,
Nor receive the plagues inflicted on her.
Give to her as she hath rendered to others;
As her works deserve, double her double portion;
As much as she has put on splendour and been luxurious,
So much of torment and of mourning give her;
For in her heart she saith:

I sit as queen, and am no widow,
And never shall I see mourning.
Because of this, one day her plagues shall come upon her,
Death and mourning and pestilence,
And she with fire shall be entirely burned,
For the Lord God who judgeth her is mighty.

The reader will call to mind, that I have not said that the parallelism here, and elsewhere in the Apocalypse, is altogether of the same perfect nature as that in Isaiah, Job, and many of the Psalms. But it is not much removed from that of several of the prophets. It is not, moreover, *synonymous* parallelism; at most, it is but rarely so; yet neither is this essential to Hebrew poetry. That there is a kind of rythmus in the structure of the sentences as above produced, no one will venture to deny; and what is true of the specimens produced, is equally true of a multitude of other passages in the Apocalypse. It were easy to swell the number of extracts; but I forbear. I can only assure the reader, that I have taken the specimens above quite at random, and that he will find the like almost anywhere, in nearly all parts of the book.

This is just what we should naturally expect. John wrote in Greek; and poetry, in the usual acceptation of the word in that language, demanded *metre*. But this was not compatible with his purpose. Nor is it very likely he would strive, while writing in Greek, after a close and exact imitation of the Hebrew poets. He has chosen a medium. He has given us *prose*, indeed, in respect to form or costume, but *prose instinct with all the qualities of poetry*.

(*g*) General Remarks on the numerosity of the Apocalypse.

If the preceding exhibition of this subject is correct and accordant with the real state of facts, some important consequences as to interpretation stand connected with it. Above all, the *trichotomy* of the Apocalypse stands preeminent in this respect. It settles the question whether there is more than one catastrophe in the book. This is a great question. It decides, moreover, in regard to subordinate parts of the book which are of the like tenor, how far they extend, and in many cases whether they sustain a near relation to each other. It extends itself to the interpunction of very many passages, deciding how the writer grouped them in his own mind, and how we also should group them, and consequently how we should distribute the interpunction. E. g. in 12: 18, the usual printing is thus: *δοῦναι μισθὸν τοῖς δούλοις σου, τοῖς προφήταις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομά σου, τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις*. This is plainly wrong. There are two groups of three each; the first is the generic *τοῖς δούλοις σου*, with the epexe-

getical or specific *προφήταις* and *ἁγίοις*; the second is the generic *τοῖς φοβουμένοις. τὸ ὄνομά σου* (corresponding plainly to *τοῖς δούλοις σου*), followed by the specific *μικροῖς* and *μεγάλοις*. And so of not a few other places in the book. In fact, the hasty reader, and even any one who does not enter minutely upon the examination of the book, can scarcely conjecture how much the smaller points of interpretation, as well as not a few of the larger, are affected by the *numerosity* of the book.

That the numbers *seven* and *four* are also to be regarded in a similar way, there can be no doubt, after the developments made above. But these do not in any measure compare with the number *three*, in respect to the frequency with which they modify the Apocalypse.

I know of no writer who has paid any very particular attention to the traits of numerosity in the Apocalypse except Züllig. Not having seen his work, as mentioned before, but only a copious review of it, I cannot go into particulars. His plan, however, is so widely discrepant from mine, that I have profited little or nothing by the view of it which I have seen. *Trichotomy*, with him, scarcely acts any considerable part in the arrangement; and all the work down to chap. xx, he refers *to the destruction of Jerusalem only*. The seven hills (17: 9) he finds in that city; the seven kings (17: 10) he also finds in Palestine; and of *three* catastrophes he knows nothing. I can only add here, that it is impossible for me to view the book in such a light as this.

I hope that I may, without subjecting myself to a charge of arrogance, be permitted to say, that if the views above given respecting *numerosity* are correct, then the study of the book, for the future, should be carried on under auspices somewhat different from those which have hitherto attended it. It is only an intimate knowledge of its relations, and of the relative and mutual adjustment of all its parts, which can ever lead to a true and satisfactory interpretation of the Apocalypse.

§ 8. *Is the Apocalypse a Drama?*

This question properly belongs to the preceding category; but I prefer to arrange it separately, in order to avoid any confusion that might arise from intermingling too many topics. Lücke has followed a similar method, § 21.

Writers have not been wanting, who have ascribed to the Apocalypse a *dramatic* form; although I know of only one (Eichhorn), who has seriously attempted to illustrate and defend this idea. The older critics and theologians paid but little attention to the *rhetoric* of the Apocalypse, and seem not to have thought of labouring to vindicate it. Hence when Oeder and Semler, of the last generation, assailed the book with great violence, in respect to its style, diction, plan, and arrangement, the credit

of it, for a number of years, was very low on the continent of Europe, until Herder and Eichhorn arose to vindicate its claims to respect and even to admiration. This they did with all but complete success; and this, at a still earlier period, Bossuet had in a good measure done, within the circle of the Romish church.

So far back as 1618, David Paraeus, in his Commentary on the Revelation, says, that 'from ch. iv. onwards a *dramatic* form predominates, and that one would not be far out of the way should he name the work a *drama propheticum*.' His vindication of such a name is very brief. 'The book exhibits,' he says, 'a constant change and succession of actors, and also interpositions of a *chorus;* and in this way it discloses, by virtue of various exhibitions, things yet to come, and imbues the minds of the spectators with many important truths.'

But if this constitutes a *drama*, then several parts of Daniel, Zechariah, Ezekiel, and of other Hebrew prophets and lyrical poets, are dramas; a proposition, which no one would now seriously think of defending. A drama exhibits things by *scenic action*, not by historic pictures of things seen in vision, as is the case with the Apocalypse.

In 1782, Hartwig published his somewhat celebrated work, *Apologie der Apocalypse*, in which he avows the opinion, that the Apocalypse is a drama. In order to vindicate this he says, that 'a drama is a piece which is full of action, where person follows person and scene succeeds scene.' He divides the whole book into five acts, limited by change of place, and shifting of scenes and of actors. But he has not attempted a formal vindication of this; and his work appears to have made but a slight impression in respect to the particular now before us.

In 1791, the celebrated Eichhorn published his *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*. In the preface to this he has introduced, explained, and endeavoured to defend, the dramatic form of the Apocalypse. In 1811, he published an Essay, *De Judaeorum Re scenicâ* (Commentt. Soc. Gott. recent. II.), designed to vindicate his views, by showing that Herod the Great and Herod Agrippa introduced theatrical representations at Jerusalem, Cesaraea, and Berytus, and consequently that the Jews could not have been ignorant of dramatic compositions. In the same year, in his Introduction to the New Testament (§ 188 seq.), he re-produced his views respecting the dramatic form of the Apocalypse, and strove at length to vindicate them. He exhibits, as he is wont to do, not a little of ingenuity and eloquence, in favour of his peculiar opinion; which, as is not unfrequently the case, seems to have been the dearer to him, the more it was neglected by others. I know of but one follower, who seems everywhere to be his humble *pedissequus*, viz. F. A. L. Matthäi, in his *Erklärung der Offenbarung*, 1828, Th. II. S. 2 ff.

Nothing more than a brief statement of Eichhorn's views relative to

the point before us, with a few remarks upon them, seems to be necessary at the present time. He begins the proper drama with 4: 1, and ends it with 21: 5. The leading parts of it he thus arranges: prelude, 4: 1—8: 5; Act I., 8: 6—12: 17; Act II., 12: 18—20: 10; Act III., 20: 11—21: 5. The prelude contains an exhibition and arrangement of the stage or theatre of action. The first act relates the siege and taking of Jerusalem, and the victory over Judaism; and it is divided into three scenes, with two exodes. It ends with a description of the feeble condition of the Jewish church. The second act exhibits the downfall of Rome, and the victory of Christianity over Heathenism; and it has two scenes and several exodes. The third act exhibits the new Jerusalem and the everlasting happiness of a future life; with which is connected the resurrection of the dead and a general judgment. The epilogue consists of the last sixteen verses of the book, viz. 21: 6—21.

The argument adduced by Eichhorn to prove the *dramatic* character of the Apocalypse, is very brief. It is, moreover, as unsatisfactory as brief. He appeals to Aristotle (Poet. c. 6) for a definition, and he represents him as saying, that "a drama is a series of events, out of which happiness or misfortune springs." Eichhorn, however, has not correctly represented the entire views of the great master of definitions. Speaking of tragedy, i. e. the drama, Aristotle says: "It is an *imitation* of action, and is performed by certain actors," (Poet. 6. 5). Again: "The drama is . . . an *imitation* of action, and of life, and of good fortune, and of misfortune," (ib. 6. 7). Once more: "They [the tragic poets] do not compose in order that they may imitate manners, but they form conceptions of these in order that they may exhibit action; for action (*τὰ πράγματα*) and mythus are the end of tragedy," i. e. of the drama, (ib.). According to Eichhorn's representations of Aristotle's definition, the drama would embrace every history of events that is extant, i. e. provided such events were concerned (as all in fact are) with the prosperity or adversity of men. Any historic representation of a series of actions, ending in good or evil, would, in accordance with such views, of course be a drama. Not so the Stagyrite. He says, 'there can be no drama without six constituents, viz. fable, manners, words, thoughts, show, song.' The last of course includes the *poetic* nature of the piece. What is set forth as reality in a drama, must, as we have seen above, be *imitated by actors;* and this imitation is what is called *show*, in the division above. Not that the actual show (*ἡ ὄψις*) is essential to the nature of the piece, (for the actual show or exhibition does not depend on the author of the drama), but that the composition in its very nature must be of a cast which is designed for exhibition, or adapted to it; see Arist. Poet. 6. 11.

Here then we take our stand; and here we may settle the question

at once. Was the Apocalypse written to be *exhibited* by actors on a stage? Is it adapted for such an exhibition? Does it contain an imitation of character, manners, or events, which is intended to be exhibited by *imitation of actors?* This is the distinctive feature of drama; and without this, no other qualities can entitle a piece to this appellation.

No proof is needed, (except it be to read the book), that the Apocalypse cannot be ranked under this category. The writer merely relates what he saw in vision. Even what he saw in vision was not acted out, in many respects. *Symbols* of what was to take place at some future period, i. e. pictorial sketches of what would take place, constitute the frame-work of the Apocalypse. If a picture is a drama, then the Apocalypse may possibly be called one; but not otherwise. The *dialogue* is only so much as Thucydides, or Xenophon, or Livy, usually presents; it is a mere incidental matter, not a main constituent element of the book. The Apocalypse is merely a narration or account of symbols seen in a vision; it is not the imitation of life, and manners, and action, by agents who are to appear upon the stage.

Eichhorn himself feels constrained to make so many exceptions to the dramatical character of the Apocalypse, that he virtually exempts it from this species of composition. 'In drama,' says he, 'things that have taken place are represented, but in the Apocalypse, things future; elsewhere words are employed, but here symbols; elsewhere the drama itself is presented for our perusal, here is only a description of a drama that was seen;' Einleit. ins N. Testament, § 188. Of what use then, we may well ask, is it to insist on such an appellation as *drama*, when all the peculiar and characteristic qualities of this kind of composition are wanting? Dialogue is wanting; living imitation by action is wanting; the presence and inspection of spectators is wanting; the narration of past occurrences is almost entirely wanting; and, in short, nothing remains but the essential characteristics of all prophetic poetry, viz. figure, simile, symbol, and peculiar diction.

Nor is this strange whim of Eichhorn's altogether harmless. He tasks John with misconceptions and faults, because he has introduced some things into his work which are inconsistent with the true nature of the drama. For example: 'The seven epistles to the churches are a transgression of this nature. The account of the woman clothed with the sun and stars, and of her teknogony, are an offence against the laws of dramatic criticism;' Einleit. § 190. And more than all this; an arrangement of the whole composition in such a manner as to correspond in any tolerable manner to the form of a drama, must of necessity break up many of the mutual relations of the piece, and substantially interfere with its *numerosity*. But of this last quality, Eichhorn had no concep-

tion. He taxes John, indeed, with *Cabbalism* in respect to the seven spirits, (1: 4); in regard to his description of the conqueror, (19: 12); and in respect to the number of the beast, (13: 18); not one of which passages, however, has he proved to have anything to do with real Cabbalism. But his mind was of a peculiar cast. When it had seized any conception, which seemed to bid fair to throw light on any dark passage of Scripture, he appears to have taken it for granted, that such conception must have a good foundation, whether he could produce vouchers for it or not. Hence it comes, perhaps, that his fame, once so dominant in Germany, went down to the tomb, as one might almost say, with the hand that penned his compositions. Recent criticism rarely alludes to him, although in many respects it owes him much.

In a word, who that is versed in the history and criticism of the Scriptures does not well know, that the Hebrews were utterly averse to the study and imitation of foreign literature—specially of the Greek, which had been forced in some measure upon them by Antiochus Epiphanes and by the Roman power? The two Herods did indeed introduce the Greek drama into two or three cities in Palestine. But it was resorted to mostly by foreigners, and was not frequently exhibited. The Jews, (the heathenizing apostates only excepted), were utterly averse to foreign literature, and never instructed their children in it, except so far as *conversation-language* was concerned. Josephus was obliged to learn it by stealth. Nothing short of the terror inspired by the Herods, could cause their dramas to be attended by Jewish spectators. Is it possible to suppose, with the remotest probability, that John would endeavour to imitate the Greek drama, in a book which he had so formally introduced and commended to the churches? The very face of the matter decides against it. And besides all this, down to the present hour the taste of nearly all Asiatics, the colonies of Greece only excepted, has never adopted or relished dramatic compositions. The Arabians, the Persians, the Turks, and others, all have their rhapsodists and their story-tellers, and are greatly attached to the amusements afforded by them; but scenic and dialogistic representations have never, to any extent, been adopted by them.

Another error on the part of Eichhorn, and one of no small importance, stands connected with his *dramatic* view of the Apocalypse. It is this, viz., that he everywhere considers the Revelation simply as a *mere literary* production, which of course is arbitrary, and owes its origin simply to the imagination and fancy of the writer. This is decidedly against all scriptural analogy. There is no other part of the New Testament, which does not obviously take its rise from the necessities or the welfare of the churches. Moved by one or both of these, the Evangelists, Paul, Peter, James, all come forward as writers. And does it

not lie upon the very face of the Apocalypse, from beginning to end, that the distresses, persecutions, and dangers of the churches, urged, and as it were compelled, the author to write? With all the sublime visions of the Apocalypse respecting the future, there is scarcely any sacred book which is designed or adapted to have a more immediate, powerful, and practical influence upon its readers. *To him that overcometh*, in the great contest between the church and its persecutors, the crown of triumph and of glory is everywhere held out. How then can we suppose John to have sat down to a purely literary and imaginative effort, like that of an author of a Greek drama? How could he think of commending himself to his Hebrew-christian readers, or even to his Gentile converts, by an attempt to entertain them with a production cast in the mould of a heathen drama? Well may we say with Lücke, in respect to this matter: "Everywhere [in the New Testament literature] it is reality, practical ends, which excite to composition; and the forms of this are the usual and obvious ones, which strike our view at once. All mere literary talent and acquisition is subordinate to the design of edification, instruction, admonition. . . . How could any one so entirely mistake the nature of the apostolical age! [So mistake it as Eichhorn has done]. At a time when a whole world is born anew, amid a contest of hostile powers, something quite different from inventing new forms of the drama occupies the mind. The views of Eichhorn, inasmuch as they entirely disregard the historical condition of things, and utterly fail to recognize the difference between ancient and modern times, cannot, on this very account, be deemed correct." Lücke, Einl. § 21.

§ 9. *Object of the book.*

The general object has already been briefly stated, at the commencement of this Introduction, § 1. My present design is to explain more fully and to defend the statement there made, and to pass in brief review some of the leading schemes of interpretation which assign to the Apocalypse a different object.

The final and complete triumph of Christianity over all opposition and all enemies, and the temporal and eternal glory and happiness to which this triumph leads the church, or still more briefly, as Lücke has stated it, '*the coming and completion of the kingdom of God*,' is the generic theme of the Revelation. To this grand central point all converges; for however numerous or diverse the subordinate parts of the book are, they all sustain a relation more or less prominent to the main theme of the work.

In making this statement, I refer merely to the grand *theme* itself of the writer, and not to the *practical ends* which he undoubtedly had in

view. The practical object to be attained by writing the book, is easily distinguishable from the theme of the writer. Indeed, the main object to be attained, and the theme of the book, stand related to each other as *final end* and *means*. The end sought for was, to encourage, console, and admonish Christians suffering under bitter and bloody persecution, and sorely tempted to apostatize or to act a timid and doubting part. On every page of the book is this enstamped. From the commencement of the proem down to the completion of the epilogue, all is filled with promise and encouragement to those who are engaged in arduous and bloody strife. The tree of life, the paradise of God, a crown of glory, regal and priestly elevation and honour, an exemption from the second death, a place and citizenship in the new Jerusalem, white raiment, even the splendid dazzling costume of the upper world, the external presence of God, exemption from hunger and thirst and cold and heat and sickness and mourning, the perpetual care of the great Shepherd who shall feed his sheep and lead them to fountains of living water, eternal rest from all trials and struggles and grievances—rest in that world where they need not sun nor moon, because the glory of God lightens it and the Lamb is its splendour—these, and the like, are the objects of promise to the faithful combatant in the army of martyrs, which are everywhere proffered in the Apocalypse. How insignificant in comparison with these, are the laurels and crowns which applauding nations can bestow, or all the fleeting glories and honours which the world itself could proffer!

Of the *practical end* to be attained, therefore, there is no room for doubt. I do not say that the writer had no other end in view but the single one that has been stated. Which of all the sacred writers has written a book as long, without designing to accomplish several purposes? But in the Apocalypse, as in the Gospels and in several of Paul's epistles, there is one main purpose that runs through the whole, and modifies it, and makes everything subordinate to its leading design. All the hortatory and monitory passages of the Revelation are true to this main design, and stamp the book with an inscription which is absolutely indelible.

Lücke (§ 25) seems to call in question this view of the book. He avers, that *δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει*, 1: 1, comp. 22: 6, proposes and adverts to *instruction* respecting the coming and kingdom of Christ as a *leading* purpose. And beyond all doubt, such instruction is the object of the main theme in itself considered. But why was any theme chosen? Why did the writer engage at all in the composition of the book? This admits of no other answer that accords with the practical tenor of the book, than the one which has already been given; and I call that the *chief* end of a book, to accomplish which

the author was principally moved to write it. In a word, it seems plain to me, from the whole tenor of the Apocalypse, that the writer chose for his theme the certain triumph of Christianity over all its enemies, and the glorious consummation of the struggle with the powers of darkness, because this theme, above all which could be chosen, was best adapted to the purposes which the author had in view. It is a truly magnificent and soul-stirring theme. To do it justice, so as to make it impressive in the measure which John desired, he must expand and adorn it, he must present not a mere outline but a finished picture. *Instruction* is of course the necessary result. What could there be of substantiality and importance in the book, if it gave no instruction? The more of this, the more certain the author must be of fully and rationally accomplishing its design. The theme then may be very *instructive*, and yet be chosen for a then present and urgent practical purpose.

When I speak of a purpose then immediately in view by the writer, I do not mean to be understood as saying, that the book was adapted only to the main and immediate purpose for which it was composed. Like the Epistles to the Corinthians, or the Gospel of Luke, it was called into being by the exigencies of the times. But like them, also, it is replete with instruction for all ages of the church, so long as any circumstances exist which resemble those that occasioned the composition of it. *Manente ratione, manet ipsa lex.* So long as Christians have to struggle against the world and the powers of darkness, so long the views and admonitions and promises of the Apocalypse are needed. Indeed, I cannot well believe that minds as enlightened as were those of the apostles and writers of the New Testament, could ever suppose that the writings which they produced were limited, in their influence and usefulness, merely to the generation in which they lived. Well may we take the position, that while the main and original object of the Apocalypse was to meet the exigencies of the time in which it was written, and while the theme was peculiarly adapted to the accomplishment of this end, still, a book duly composed in such circumstances and in order to meet actual wants and woes, must present more or less which will always be useful at every period of the world. The great combat with sin, in some form or other, is never to cease while the probation of man continues. Of course, then, the Apocalypse will always afford matter of admonition and encouragement to Christians.

The view which has now been given of the original and main design of the Apocalypse, and of the theme which was chosen by the writer for the accomplishment of this design, is more important than most readers may be prepared to consider it. The leading direction which must be given to the exegesis of the book depends upon it, and several questions of a critical nature, which are highly important, stand connected

with it. To adduce the evidences that the view in question is correct, would be to recapitulate the whole contents of the Apocalypse. I cannot at present occupy my own time, or that of the reader, with doing this. I must content myself with simply saying, that the careful perusal of the book, independently of any theory of interpretation, first gave to me this view, and that this has been more and more confirmed by all subsequent study of it. I must request the reader who has doubts in respect to it, to apply himself to the simple and continuous perusal of the book, in order to ascertain what was the main and immediate object of the writer. I anticipate with confidence, that he will come to the same result to which I have come.

How much the object now before us has been overlooked by the older commentators, needs no other evidence than the study of them. Let us select the most favourite and popular stand-point of many theologians and critics, and for a moment examine it. They assumed, that the great object of John was to give *an outline of church history down to the end of the world.* With this, of course, is intermingled a great deal of civil history—the revolutions and changes of states and empires. The consequence has been, that we are said to have, according to the various views of expositors, either the history of the Jews and of the Romans in more ancient times; or the history of Rome during the decline and fall of the Roman empire; or the history of the middle ages principally, specially of the rise and spread of popery, with its persecutions and its idolatry; or, as others will, we have also the history of the Reformation, of the various corruptions of the church by heretics, of the Roman Catholic orders of monks, of the persecutions excited by them, of the decline of the papal hierarchy with its final overthrow, and of the ultimate triumph of pure Christianity over all error and opposition. According to some expositors, even the petty monarchies of modern Europe, and not a little of their individual history, is sketched out by John in the Apocalypse, and many of the comparatively insignificant sects of modern and even recent heretics are described. To views which are substantially these, or like to these, no less men than even Joseph Mede and Campegius Vintringa have acceded. What might not be expected, then, from men who seldom thought or examined for themselves!

In respect to every attempt of this sort at expounding the great design of the Apocalypse, much of doubt and difficulty must now arise in the mind of a serious and candid inquirer, when he is once put upon the track of *simple historico-critical exegesis*—along which track the science of interpretation now bids us to move. Readily will such an one be inclined to ask: What analogy is there in all the Scriptures for such a method of prophecy? Rarely are very distant future events made the subject of prediction—never, unless indeed they stand closely connected

with the welfare of God's chosen people. Almost everything that is remote, is, in the Old Testament, brought to view merely because it has some relation to Christ or his kingdom. And even here how brief, how general, how destitute of individual specification and minuteness, are all predictions of this nature! If the reader doubts this for a moment, I must beg him to go back, and reperuse § 2. of this Introduction. There can be no appeal from a *pragmatic* view of this subject; and such an one is there given.

Well may the candid reader also ask: What is the object of the Scriptures? *Civil* history or *religious?* If any one should say: 'We have such history in the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles;' the answer would not be difficult. Is anything more plainly enstamped on the face of all these and the like books, than that they are mainly the *religious*, and not merely the civil, history of the Hebrews? They are a species of *preaching by facts;* while the prophecies (so called) assume almost the usual form of homilies. When the *future* is at all disclosed by the Hebrew prophets, it is for the sake of warning and admonition, of rousing hope or exciting fear; and all this, not in a merely civil, but mainly in a *religious* respect.

What inducement, now, could John have to disclose by prediction, the ecclesiastical history of the churches in distant ages? Was this meeting the wants, or alleviating the woes, or exciting the hopes of the church, then bleeding at every pore under the monster Nero—merely to furnish them with an abstract of the history of Popes and Jesuits, who would live more than a thousand years after they were dead? And what *consolation* could it be to the agonizing Christians of Nero's day, to know that ecclesiastical Rome and her adherents in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries would become corrupt beyond all example, and haughty also, and blood-thirsty, while true religion would be nearly extinguished? This seems to be very ill-adapted to console the oppressed and anxious Christian of the primitive times, who was fearful lest the light of salvation might be extinguished by the blood of the martyrs.

In whatever light I view such a scheme of explanation or exegesis of the main design of the Apocalypse, I am constrained to think it ungrounded and improbable. It is not probable, that it was any object with the holy prophets to gratify mere prurient curiosity about future historic events—events connected only with civil or ecclesiastical history. What really useful purpose could this subserve? I cannot—I must not—regard the Apocalypse as in effect nothing more than a mere *Syllabus of History.* Often have we heard it reiterated: 'Is it probable, that God would leave his church without a knowledge of what was to happen to it in future?' To this question I should answer No, in one respect, and Yes, in another. God has not left his church without a

vivid representation of its future and certain and universal triumph and sway. This rests on foundations as firm as those of the throne of God and the kingdom of his grace. The Apocalypse as it now is, interpreted in the manner which has been above proposed, speaks all this in language not to be misunderstood. Thus much, then, as to all that can cheer and encourage Christians. But on the other hand, of what *moral* use would it be, to gratify a prurient curiosity about all the minute events connected with the history of the church down to the end of time? Indeed, it would be necessary to write ten thousand Apocalypses at least, in order to present us in reality with such a history. But what would these contribute towards *moral* suasion or *religious* impression and admonition? Nothing—yea, less than nothing; for it would be an intolerable burden to the Christian church, to make or to print even an abstract of them. It is indeed a degradation of the book of Revelation, to turn it into a syllabus of mere worldly history.

The day has past by, as I would fain hope and trust, in which all attempts to explain ancient writings, without regard to the circumstances of the author, or of his friends, of the times in which he wrote, and of the special object that induced him to write, can meet with extensive approbation or encouragement. All other books, the Old Testament and most of the New not excepted, are explained in this way. Why should the Apocalypse be treated as an exception to all other writings in the world?

If now, in addition to all this, we take into view the fact, that the Revelation may be explained to much greater advantage, and much more in consonance with the laws of exegesis and with the understanding and reason of mankind, provided we give due attention to the circumstances and condition of the writer and of his fellow Christians, how can we hesitate as to which of the methods of interpretation before us is to be chosen? Doubt, in this case, would spread corresponding doubt and darkness over the whole Bible, provided the expositor were consistent with himself in the application of such principles.

However confident, therefore, any particular persons may be in applying the symbols of the Apocalypse to distant events of church-history, yet the time has passed by, in which confidence can be reposed by really enlightened interpreters, who make this book an object of attentive study, in merely imaginative and ever floating exegesis. Where is one spot of *terra firma* in its whole domain? No two expositors belonging to this class agree, unless where one is a mere satellite of another. And why not? Because their method of interpretation depends on mere fancy, imagination, conjectural resemblances, or perhaps sectarian views, and other such things, and therefore can neither secure unity nor command respect. Witness the volumes without number of prophetical

or theological romances that have already been poured forth, under the excitement and guidance of such views as I have now been characterizing. It is time—high time—for *principle* to take the place of *fancy*, for exegetical *proof* to thrust out *assumption*, and for all men to call to mind, that the apostles did not occupy themselves with writing conundrums and charades. They wrote to be read and understood by those to whom they addressed themselves; and if they were understood, it was by virtue of explaining their writings in a manner which accorded with the usual laws and principles of exegesis. These never could have given birth to a scheme of interpretation, which divests the Apocalypse of all present and proper regard to the churches, clothed as they then were in sackcloth, groaning under oppression, and often bathed in their own blood. To forget all this, and to engage oneself in the leisurely and fanciful employment of sketching traits of historical events in distant future ages, and many of these merely *civil* events—is not appropriate work for the illustrious exile wandering on the barren and sea-girt rocks of Patmos.

Not much better than this have those interpreters done, who have found in the Apocalypse little else but the Roman conquest of Judea and Jerusalem, excepting the final erection of a new and spiritual kingdom. So Hartwig, in his famous *Apologie der Offenbarung*. So, for substance, Herder in his *Maran Atha;* so, in a large measure, Wetstein; and so, fully, Züllig in his recent work. Others of less note have done the same. Yet nothing less than absolute violence can make Rev. xii—xix. relate to *Judea* and *Jerusalem*. The great mass of commentators have regarded, and do still regard, such an exegesis as impossible.

On the other hand, there are not wanting those who regard John as having been altogether partial to the Jews, and as purposely exempting Jerusalem from anything more than temporary and moderate chastisement. Of this class is Ewald in his Commentary; and here, in some good measure, seem also to be found De Wette and Bleek. Heathen Rome and its adherents are, with this class of critics, the great object of the Apocalypse. But how can one well doubt, after reading chap. vii. which shows what portion of the *Jews* are to be exempted from punishment, and chap. xi. (specially v. 8) which shows, too specifically to admit of being explained away, that *Jerusalem* is to fall—how can he doubt, that the *persecuting Jews* are the objects of the prophetic threatening? Let him moreover read Matt. xxiv, and then consider the striking similarity between the tenor of this and that of Rev. vi—xi.; and to all this let him add the consideration, that no reference to Rome, at least none that can be rendered probable, is to be found in the first eleven chapters of the Apocalypse; and then I do not see how he can in any way render it probable, that merely *heathen* persecutors are the subjects

of consideration and of commination in the Apocalypse. The principal support of such an opinion is, that the Apocalyptist has not as fully and plainly announced the destruction of Jerusalem in chap. xi, as he has that of great Babylon in chap. xvi. xix. The fact, that it is less fully and prominently announced, must indeed be conceded. But still, that it is announced, and moreover that the very plan of the work necessarily demands that it should be considered as taking place, I cannot, after the most attentive and often repeated consideration of the subject, see any good reason to doubt. But the special arguments in favour of this position must be reserved for detail in the commentary.

While I entertain a distinct and vivid apprehension, that Judaism and Heathenism are both brought upon the scene of action as the great antagonists of Christianity, yet I cannot, after all, subscribe to the statement of Eichhorn and many of his followers, viz. that "the fundamental idea of the Apocalypse is, the victory of Christianity over Judaism and Heathenism, and the establishment of the subsequent kingdom of the Blessed;" Einleit. § 187. This statement is too abstract and merely theoretical, in the first place; and in the second, it is defective in some important respects. It is not simply and merely the ultimate predominance of Christianity over all its enemies, or rather over Jewish and Roman power, which is held up to view. It is Christianity as struggling first, and for a long time, with bitter Jewish enemies, who are in various ways weakened and ultimately destroyed; then it is Christianity struggling with the tremendous Roman power which governed the world —yea carrying on a death-struggle for a long time and with agonies often repeated—until finally victory lights upon the standard of the cross; it is Christianity not in the *abstract* (so to speak), but in the *concrete*, which John presents and holds up to our view, while she is bathed in blood and wrapped in flames, and finally comes out from all like gold from the fiery furnace.

Nor is this all. Eichhorn has entirely failed to discern the *trichotomy* of the book. The *two* great enemies which he recognizes, are surely not the only ones with which Christianity is called to contend. After a long season of peace, prosperity, and wide diffusion, new enemies rise up, and league together against her. The hosts of Gog and Magog, from the ends of the earth and in numbers like the sands of the sea, assemble and march against the holy metropolis of Christianity. Heaven arrests them ere they have stricken any fatal blow, and they perish in a summary and awful manner. Gog and Magog are an enemy and an empire different from the Roman; and this view involves the idea of an opposition differing in some of its characteristics from either of the others. But, being in the *distant* future, it is merely sketched and not dwelt upon; the apocalyptic view in this case being very brief, like all other prophecies of a similar nature.

It is thus, that Christianity is presented not merely as struggling and triumphant, but as struggling at different periods for a long succession of time, and never fully and finally victorious until Satan is remitted to his perpetual prison. It is, as the apostle Paul said of himself, Christianity "made a spectacle to angels and men," in a great variety of attitudes, and passing through trials and dangers which seem not only to threaten it, but to have the power of destroying it. No hero of any epic poem is anywhere presented on a theatre of such intense and long-continued and agonizing action. But victory and a crown of unfading glory is awarded, at last, by the King of kings and Lord of lords. No other Epic can lay claim to higher, more intense, more varied, more constant, more perilous, and finally to more successful action, than the Apocalypse assigns to Christianity.

All this is so plain, and lies so upon the very face of the Revelation, that it would have been seen and acknowledged ages ago, had not a deep and all-pervading *mystical* exegesis led astray the Christian public. If, (as was deemed not only allowable but expedient), the mystical interpretation might be applied to the simple narratives and parables of the Gospels, and to the Epistles of Paul and others, surely it might with ten-fold reason be applied to a book so veiled and mysterious as the Apocalypse seemed to be. The very form and nature of the book helped to give currency and authority to such views; and of course the Apocalypse has been, in almost every age, as it were a mass of wax mouldable at the will and fancy of every one who undertook to shape it. The recent vindications of the claims of simple and artless exegesis, however, have gradually been producing their legitimate effect on the interpretation of this book, and, as at least it is to be hoped, fancy-work and conceit and visionary speculation have had their day, and are not much longer to exercise their mischievous power. The Apocalypse is to be judged of in like manner as any other symbolic Epopee. Poetry is to be considered as poetry, and symbol as symbol; unity of design is to be expected and sought for; and such a view of the book is to be taken, as has a basis in the persuasion, that it was written for a then present and important exigency, which existed when the author engaged in his work. Like every other writer, John must be judged of in a sober and rational way, and with constant reference to his intention, his circumstances, his idiom, and his primitive readers. From a judgment formed in this way, the author of the book need not, if he were now living, feel disposed to shrink. It cannot be otherwise than highly honourable to his plan and designs, and also to his powers of execution.

§ 10. *Economy of the Apocalypse, or manner in which the plan is developed.*

Much that belongs here has already been said, in disclosing the peculiar forms of the book which result from its *numerosity;* see § 7, particularly (*a*) seq. But before we proceed to the particular consideration of the subject indicated by the inscription above, it may be proper to say a word in respect to those, who regard the Apocalypse as being properly exempt from all investigation and criticism, which is of such a nature as the inscription necessarily implies that stands at the head of the present section.

Writers have not been wanting, and individuals are not still wanting, who object to all critical and rhetorical analysis of the book before us, *because it is a book divinely inspired.* Kleuker (no mean critic, by the way), says, in his defence of the Apocalypse against the theory of Eichhorn, who regarded this book as a mere work of genius and fancy, that 'we are not to bring *invention* and *art* into the account of its composition, but rather an *involuntary inspiration*, which is independent of art, and implies that the seer is transported out of himself;' (Ursprung und Zweck der Offenb. § 841). Hence he concludes, that the theory of Eichhorn is destitute of any solid basis, and that we are not to seek for the application of any of the *rules of art* to a book of such a character. Nor does Kleuker stand alone in entertaining such views. There have been and now are some, who consider it as a kind of profanation to subject any scriptural book to a logical or rhetorical analysis.

What shall we say, then, to views like these? So far as Eichhorn is concerned, I should entirely agree with Kleuker in rejecting his superficial view of the Apocalypse, and the ranking of it among works of mere fancy and imagination. But to maintain that the book has no plan, and no method in which that plan is carried into execution, because it is of divine origin, would be a most extravagant and incredible paradox. Did not God make the human mind? Has he not enstamped upon it the laws of logic and rhetoric, so that, in its higher developments, those laws are necessarily as well as spontaneously obeyed? And if God thus reveals himself *in man* who is made in his own image, will he have no regard to all this in an external revelation? Does the *want* of logic and rhetoric prove anything to be of divine origin? If not, then the presence of them will not disprove the inspiration of the sacred writers.

So far, moreover, as rhetorical development and the laws of aesthetics are concerned, what rational man has been able to show, that bishop Lowth's noble work on Hebrew poetry is to be cast away, because he

has laboured to show the rhetorical and aesthetical beauties of the Old Testament poetry, and the art which is exhibited in the composition of it? Is not *poetry* in its very nature an art? Are not its measure, and rhythm, and parallelism, and peculiar idiom, and appropriate choice of diction, connected with *art?* And as to nearly one half of all the Old Testament—is it not poetry?

But what shall we say to the *alphabetic* Psalms, specially the 119th; to the alphabetic book of Lamentations; to the like composition in Prov. xxxi.? And even in the New Testament, what is to be said to Matthew's genealogy, where *fourteens* are artificially made, by the omission of many links in the chain of ancestors? What can we say to these and the like exhibitions in the Scriptures, except that when God speaks to men, he speaks *more humano?* He certainly speaks *by men, to men, and for men.* He speaks then so as to be understood; and of course, the sacred writers employ language as others do, else they could not be understood. Is it any derogation from the dignity and usefulness of the sacred writings, that they exhibit a great variety of composition, adapted to different tastes and capacities? On the contrary, is it not a striking evidence of God's paternal kindness and condescension, that he has adapted his instructions to all classes of men, who are to be benefited by them?

If now *alphabetic* compositions, adapted to help the memory of learners, have found their way into the Bible, and even a whole book of Lamentations has taken such a form from the taste of the author or of the age, why should the *numerosity* of the book of Job, or of the Apocalypse, be objected to the composition? It is certain, that numbers are higher symbols, and more expressive, than mere alphabetic sequency of words or of *στίχοι.* It is even certain, that *trichotomy* has something in its very nature which is pleasing, and adapted to arrest our attention. Do not the latest and most popular schemes of philosophy itself resolve themselves into a basis which implies trichotomy?

But whether we consent or deny, in respect to this matter, changes not, and cannot change, the state of *fact.* The fact is before every reader's eyes; and he might as well deny that the sun shines in a midday serene sky, as to deny that *numerosity* and *alphabetic composition* belong to a part of the sacred books.

Here then is *art;* not in the bad, but in the good sense of this word. And if this be so, then we may investigate it, point it out, make it known to readers, and call their attention to it. The sacred books were composed in order to be read, studied, closely and thoroughly investigated; and the more this is done, to the more advantage will they appear.

Of all the theories respecting inspiration that have been broached, I

know of none which appears to me further from the truth, than that which makes the sacred writers mere *automata*, moved not at all by their own power or choice, but by an irresistible power which supersedes the use of their own faculties. To affirm, as a well known writer who now figures upon the stage in Germany has done, that "when the Spirit of God comes in, the soul of man goes out," is to affirm that soulless and rationless beings are more appropriate instruments of teaching, than beings fully possessing souls and enlightened reason. It is impossible to make the mass of thinking men, at the present time, believe in extravagances like this.

There is as much variety and difference, both in manner and matter, among the sacred writings, as among Greek, Roman, or English classics. There is every possible evidence of variety of taste and talent displayed in the works of scriptural writers. If any one should say that Haggai or Malachi are on a par in aesthetics with Isaiah and Habakkuk, am I to distrust my senses, my understanding, and my taste, in such a manner as to believe this? Nothing demands such a distrust; and even if I would exercise it, the laws of my nature forbid it, when I read these books. Yet the actual instruction conveyed by the one or the other, is equally authentic and credible. It is only the *rhetorical* or *aesthetical* character of the books, which is so exceedingly diverse.

But where are we now? These differences in the style of different authors do actually exist; artificial modes of composition, moreover, lie before us in full view; all the varieties of style which different tastes and talents of men give rise to, are undeniable predicates of the sacred books. And why should we not notice and examine these and the like facts? Why should we not point out characteristics which lie either upon the face of the scriptural compositions, or which are more covertly interwoven with the very texture of them, and need to be patiently and carefully investigated? God has not derogated from the authority or dignity of his communications, by giving them an aesthetical character which is varied so as to allure all ranks and conditions of men. He has spoken to children as children; to full grown men as such. The Apocalypse, it cannot be doubted, is adapted *τοῖς διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἔχουσι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*. There is elsewhere milk for babes; but the Revelation is doubtless "meat for full grown men." Does the book lose any of its value on this account? Far from it. Does not the great apostle to the Gentiles tell us, that he preached *σοφίαν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις*, while he refrained from so doing among others who had made but little progress in the knowledge of divine things? 1 Cor. ii. What he did in preaching other teachers might do in writing. And if they have done it, (as surely they have), then we may investigate any such writing, and point out its method, its logic, its aesthetics, and in a word its whole literary character.

To scan the book by the mere technical rules of the logic or rhetoric of the schools, would not, I readily acknowledge, be an appropriate exercise of criticism. It is not to be thus examined or judged of. Still the Apocalypse is a composition which follows some laws of the human mind. It would not be intelligible at all, if it did not; and if it does, it is the proper office of criticism to point out what laws it has followed, and how far they may compare with the laws of composition as prescribed by the schools. Our reception or rejection of the book as authentic in matters of doctrine and duty, does not depend on the results of such an investigation. Not that I think the Apocalypse has anything to fear from such a scrutiny; but be this as it may, the duty of a critic to analyze and explain the structure and continuity of any sacred book, is none the less because it is sacred. I may well repeat here what I have already said above. When God speaks to men, he speaks *more humano*. What bids us, then, to refrain from examining the plan and economy of the Apocalypse, provided we do it with candour, with sober scrutiny, and with that high respect which the nature of the work and the character of its author demands? To examine for the mere purpose of condemning or carping, is a very different matter from examining for the purpose of acquiring instruction.

My examination of the Apocalypse has ended in the conviction, that this book has the same claims, or as well-grounded claims, to be considered as the result of inspiration, as the other books of the New Testament. Its object, aim, and even the manner of its execution, will bear comparison with any other work of the New Dispensation. If any are surprised at a declaration like this, I can only say here, that I hope fully to justify such a conclusion, before I have done with the examination of the work. But I do not apprehend that *inspiration* whatever aid it gave a writer in the way of illumination and guidance, changed the peculiarities of that writer's style, or hindered the full and proper exercise of his logical and rhetorical powers. The result of all my researches into the nature of inspiration, is a full belief that its influence is rather to be considered as resulting in a *state* than in an *act*. What I mean is, that by inspiration the state or condition of him who is the subject of it is affected; his mind is enlightened respecting things proper to be said, of which he was before totally or partially ignorant; his views and affections are elevated; his powers of mind are in a degree quickened and heightened; things sensual and deluding and degrading recede, and for the time being cease to annoy him; and his judgment, as to what he is to communicate, becomes not only more discerning, but more sound and safe. The *inspired* John, for example, is the same individual as the *uninspired* John, and retains all the innocent peculiarities of his character and habitudes; but the inspired John is elevated,

enlightened, quickened, keen of discernment even to such a degree that future things can be seen from his elevated condition, and he is so guided by all the combinations of influence upon him that he will communicate nothing but truth. Were I to choose a simile for illustration, I should say, that the inspired man ascends an intellectual and moral eminence so high, that his prospect widens almost without bounds, and what is altogether hidden from ordinary men is more or less distinctly within his view.

Such, in my view, is the *state* of a sacred writer, when he takes up his pen for the instruction of the church. In this state, we may of course expect from him truth, and nothing but truth. But in communicating this, he does not lose his own proper characteristics either of feeling or of style. Enough that he is guarded from error, that truths beyond the reach of his natural powers are impressed upon his mind, and that, in this state, each writer preserves and exhibits all the peculiarities that naturally belong to him. One needs but to compare Paul and John, Isaiah and Malachi, in order to feel that this, or something very much like it, must be true. And if this be conceded, then it follows, that whatever be the agency of the Spirit upon an inspired man, he is still as really and truly a free agent in his inspired state as he was before. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." And more exactly to our purpose still: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," 1 Cor. 14: 32. If so, then "the soul of man has [not] gone out, when the Spirit of God comes in." The diversities of style and plan, throughout all the Scriptures, is evidence which cannot be set aside, that this matter must be substantially as has now been stated.

On the other hand; I have said that inspiration does not seem to be an *act*. This is but an imperfect expression of my meaning, and needs explanation. What I mean is, that an inspired writer is not the mere *passive* instrument of the Spirit of God, mechanically writing, like an amanuensis, only what is dictated to him *verbatim et literatim*. It is impossible to reconcile Paul's assertion with this. The differences in style, diction, plan, and execution, among the sacred writers, can receive no tolerable explanation on such a ground. Besides; that the prophets are not mere *passive* instruments, follows from the refusal of some of them to exercise the prophetic gift. Jeremiah kept back; Jonah refused; and others have done the like; all of which is incompatible with the idea of mere passive instrumentality.

In a word; if John was to write an Apocalypse for the edification and consolation of the churches, such a state of mind and feeling as fitted him for this work, such an influence as enlightened what was dark, guided where the path was dubious, withheld when a wandering step was about to be taken, and bestowed the power of judging what and

how much the work should contain—is all that can be reasonably asked for, and all that is needful. Higher certainty as to what was communicated could be obtained in no other way that has yet been proposed.

We should add to all this, that the inspired writer was conscious of being influenced by a power from above. I cannot stop to prove this point; but the repeated declarations of the Old Testament prophets, of Paul also, and of John, show that such was the fact.

But it does not follow from all this, that the prophets could separate, by their own consciousness when in such a state, the influence of the Spirit on their minds from the action of their minds themselves. It is easy to illustrate what I mean. Those who are *born again* or *regenerated*, are not able to distinguish the boundaries between the influence of the Spirit and the action of their own minds. They have a distinct feeling and conviction that their minds are in some way brought to a new state. Of this they are conscious. But they are not able to point out a single thing which they have felt or done, in which they were mere passive instruments and not active agents. The Saviour has adverted to the mysterious action of the Spirit in this case, and strongly asserted it. But as to the power of any person to single out individual acts or feelings, and renounce from distinct consciousness his active participation in them—that, it will be conceded, is out of question.

Who then can draw the line of distinction between the *voluntary* and *involuntary* parts which an inspired writer has acted, in the composition of a book? If we fix even upon the disclosures of the future, it would be difficult for us to say, how far the elevation and illumination of our minds might enable us to see into it, and to judge of it. We believe it must be the influence of the Holy Spirit which brings the mind to such a state; but when the prophet is in this state, how far he acts and speaks by virtue of his own proper agency, and how far as a mere passive instrument—who can define?

It follows then from all this, that if we are to examine and judge at all of any sacred writing, as to its plan and character, *we must take it as a whole.* We cannot draw lines of distinction between one part and another. The plan is a whole; the execution of it consists of many subordinate parts, all related to the general plan. There is no way, if we examine at all, but to examine the whole. And what should hinder us from inquiring, in what particular way it has pleased God to reveal certain truths to his church, and what are the methods for the accomplishment of such an end which his wisdom has seen fit to sanction?

The reader, if he duly weighs these considerations, will be prepared more readily to proceed to an account of the economy of the Apocalypse. He will not take offence at what is not designed to give offence, nor consider it as profanation to inquire, in what way John has accom-

plished the end he had in view. It may be, however, that the reader will feel at a loss to know for what purpose all this seeming digression has been indulged in; if so, he will soon be able to solve his doubts.

In the composition of the Apocalypse there is a continuous series of *vision* and *symbol*, from beginning to end. How much of all this is the mere *costume* of the piece, depending on the pleasure of the writer who is in the state already described? Or how much is to be considered as having a proper historical basis, i. e. as founded upon *facts* which are narrated? For example; are the state of exile at Patmos, the day of the vision, the Christophany, the rapture into heaven, the vision of God and of surrounding angels, the sealed book, the Lamb, and other like things, to be regarded as *proper realities* which are merely described? Or are all these to be considered as the mere costume with which the mind of the writer has invested the piece, in order to render it attractive and impressive?

Examples may be adduced, that would seem to support an affirmative answer to the last of these questions. If we peruse attentively the 18th Psalm, we shall soon see that the picture there given of the descent of the divine Majesty, of his bowing the heavens, shaking the earth, riding upon a cherub, surrounding himself with dark clouds and lightning and thunder, scattering the enemies of David by hail-stones and coals of fire, laying bare the deepest abysses of the sea, and drawing the chosen king out of many waters—that all this, is plainly *costume*. The simple truth that lies under all these symbols, is, that God appeared for David, i. e. manifested his favour towards him, oftentimes and in an extraordinary manner, and delivered him from enemies and persecutors. So the inscription to the Psalm bids us to interpret it, and so vs. 17—20 plainly and unequivocally declare that it must be interpreted. No one who well understands the nature of poetry and the use of symbols will object to this view; and surely no one can regard all this as in any measure derogatory to the dignity and truthfulness of the sacred writings.

Is the Apocalypse, now, only a more protracted series of symbols which are of the like nature? Are the visions themselves, and all the objects of them, merely the drapery thrown around the body of truth that lies within? Do all these things depend merely on the judgment and imagination of the writer, as to the manner in which he should so develope the views which he entertained as to be most impressive and attractive?

Many would start back, perhaps, from such a result, fearing that it would at once strip the Apocalypse of all claim to be considered as a true revelation. Yet the 18th Psalm, and many other pieces of the like nature, belong no less to the Scriptures, because they exhibit much that is symbol, and which is consequently no more than *costume*. But if

there be symbol, let it be remembered that *something must be symbolized;* if there be drapery or costume, there must be some *person* which is invested with it. A passage of Scripture like Ps. 18: 6—16, is not the less significant because it is made up of a series of symbols; I might truly say, that it is the more significant, because the impression made by it is much more vivid than what could be made by plain and simple prose.

Even so it might be with the Apocalypse. If it were all like so many parables, or all clothed merely in the poetic garb which a vivid imagination had woven, it would not alter any important part of the instruction which it now conveys. All the change which would be made by this mode of composition and its consequent exegesis would be, that the circumstances which attend the composition of the work must not be regarded as historic realities, but as merely imaginary conceptions for the purpose of giving vivacity and interest to the piece, while the actual doctrines inculcated, or disclosures made, would remain the same, whether we assumed this mode of composition, or the one which takes for granted, that many of the things stated and having a relation to the main composition are founded in real fact. The book of Job, for example, is equally significant as to its main objects, whether we suppose the things related in the Prologue and Epilogue, to be facts or allegory. Nothing taught by the poem itself, is in any measure changed by the one assumption or the other. And such would plainly be the case in respect to the Apocalypse, so far as a great portion of the work is concerned, and in fact so far as appropriate Christian doctrine or disclosure of the future is at all concerned.

With such views, I feel less interest in the question about the extent of symbolical representation in the Apocalypse, than some writers have done. We have a great mass of examples in the Hebrew prophets, which would serve at once to show, that a writing loses nothing of significance because it is made up of symbols. All parables, allegories, and fables, are made up of symbols; but surely they are not more destitute of meaning than plain, direct, simple speech. Nor would it derogate from the Apocalypse, in respect to anything very important, were we to suppose that all its modes of representation are merely symbolical, its visions as well as its imagery.

Thus much to allay the fears of some, as to the credit of the book when thus considered. But I should not do justice to my own convictions, were I to stop here. After all that can be said in favour of such a view, I am persuaded that it will not stand the test of a fair scrutiny.

No intelligent reader of the Apocalypse will deny, that there are many and striking resemblances between the Old Testament prophets and this book; specially must this be admitted in respect to the prophe-

cies of Ezekiel and Daniel. But in these books repeated mention is made of prophetic ecstasy, during which symbols expressive of many and important truths were disclosed to the seer. Thus in Ezek. 1: 1, the writer "sees the heavens opened, and beholds the visions of God." "The hand of the Lord is upon him," 1: 3, and he falls upon his face, like one deprived of the use of his bodily faculties, 1: 28. The hand of the Lord is strong upon him, and conveys him [in spirit] to a great distance, 3: 12—14, 22. The like in 8: 1, 3, 7, 16. 11: 1, 5, 24. 37: 1. 40: 1, 2, 17, 24, 32, 35, etc. Altogether in the same way is the statement in Dan. 7: 1. 8: 1, 2. The effect of this last vision is fainting and sickness on the part of Daniel, Dan. 8: 27. So in Dan. 10: 8—10. Comp. also Zech. 4: 1. The vision of Isaiah, chap. 6: 1—7, is of the like tenor; Is. 8: 11 recognizes the same strong hand of the Lord that is mentioned above.

If we turn now to the Apocalypse, we find there the same kind of representations. John is *in the spirit*, 1: 10; he falls down like one dead, 1: 17. *In the spirit* is he taken up into heaven, 4: 1, 2, and there begins a series of visions which go through the whole book. Why now should not this be regarded as matter of fact, as well as the vision of Peter in Acts 10: 9—16, or the spiritual rapture of Paul, 2 Cor. 12: 1—41, or the vision of Stephen, Acts 7: 55, 56? I know of no good reason why we should deny the actual existence of prophetic ecstasies, unless indeed we are bound to deny all which is extraordinary or truly prophetic. But to canvass such a question would lead us quite beyond the limits appropriate to our present object. I can only say, that for myself I do believe in the *divine inspiration* of the prophets; and consequently I see no good reason to deny that John was, as he affirms, *in the spirit on the Lord's day.*

Along with *matters of fact* I must also class the presence of John in the isle of Patmos, the appearance of Christ to the eye of his mind while in a state of ecstasy; and along with these, the messages for substance to be conveyed to the churches, and then the succession of symbolic phenomena that follow. That he saw all these with his *bodily* eyes, the Apocalypse not only does not assert, but even contradicts by the declaration, that John was in a state of prophetic rapture or ecstasy. The eye of the mind has sharper sight than that of the body; and the visions of the Apocalypse are by no means the less real visions, because they were discernible only by the eye of the mind.

If any one is still disposed to maintain that all statements of this nature belong merely to the *drapery* of prophecy, he would do well to tell us, why the prophets, e. g. Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, do, at one time, state the circumstance of vision, dream, ecstasy, etc., and at another do not? If there was nothing different in one kind or mode of

revelation from that in another, why should any difference as to the manner of it be at all pretended? So far then as circumstances preparatory to the vision of John, or the fact whether he really saw a vision, are concerned, we may and should regard the whole as a *reality*. Neither of these pertain merely to the symbols of the book.

How much, then, which the book discloses in the visions, belongs to *reality?* What and how much is *drapery*, and what is *person?*

A minute and circumstantial answer to these questions will not be expected here, and is not needed. The great leading truths involve the subordinate ones; and it will therefore be enough to glance at them.

I would comprise within the design of the proem to the Apocalypse, the instructions, consolations, and admonitions, intended for the Asiatic churches. The *form* of the seven epistles belongs appropriately to John, who has carried *trichotomy* through the whole, and followed in all of them the same general model of arrangement. But the *substance* of the instruction here communicated, I should not hesitate to ascribe to the charge which he received in vision from the Great Head of the churches. This is truly and faithfully conveyed or exhibited; but the drapery receives its hue and its shape from the plastic hand which furnishes it.

Next, as to the *first catastrophe*. The destruction of Jerusalem, and the fall of the Jewish persecuting power, are truths or facts about the reality of which he can have no doubt, who reads Matt. xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi. The first part of the Apocalypse, chap. iv—xi., is occupied with the same theme. The subordinate truths are, that the Jews will be punished in a great variety of ways and by a series of protracted judgments; that most of them will become more obdurate and rebellious, under the rebukes and judgments of heaven; and finally, that Christians will have warning and will escape from the general destruction. The certainty that the church will triumph in this rencontre, and the encouragement which Christians have to persevere in their fidelity, lies upon the face of all that is said within the limits of this first catastrophe. Such are the prominent and leading truths here taught; and all these are taught by a succession of splendid symbols, the like of which is presented by no other book that belongs to the Scriptures. To investigate, classify, arrange, and explain these symbols, is a work of time, and skill, and patience; specially after all the darkness that has been collected and thrown upon them. But I must believe it is still a feasible work, and that we are not obliged to wander in uncertainty, if our course be shaped by the land-marks which the writer has himself set up.

The second catastrophe has an ample basis, as to the principal *fact* which it discloses, in the Old Testament and in the New. To avoid repetition here, I must request the reader to cast his eye once more over the synoptical view of the Messianic kingdom, which is given in

§ 2. above; where, especially in the predictions of Isaiah, he will find ample proof that *Gentiles*, as well as Jews, are to be brought into subjection to the Prince of Peace. And if Rev. xiii—xix. be compared, as to its main subject, with 2 Thess. ii., is it not plain that Paul cherished the same general views as John? What is said in 1 Cor. 15: 24—27, and in Rom. 11: 11—26, as well as many other passages in Paul's epistles, is of the same tenor. So the declarations of the Saviour in John 12: 32, 10: 16, and elsewhere; and of the like tenor is the command to go and teach *all nations*. But as to the subordinate parts of this generic truth, it is plain that John assumes the fact, that the beast and false prophet, combined with Satan, are more formidable and more lasting and active enemies to Christianity, than those brought to view under the first catastrophe. Hence he dwells upon them longer, although the process of their punishment is less copiously described. Justice in this case seems to be represented as executing in some respects a more summary process; perhaps on account of the greater danger to the church from the heathen enemies; perhaps because the long suffering of God to the Jewish nation, as exhibited under the first catastrophe, was intended by the writer to be more fully displayed. But the final consummation of the second catastrophe is not so sudden and complete, as in the first one. Rev. xvi. shows that the head-quarters of the enemy are invaded and overthrown, so that he is greatly crippled. But the heathen Roman power was widely diffused. The persecutions of Rome were long protracted. Hence the *mora* or delay in the description of its final overthrow. Chap. xvii. xviii. are episodes; but chap. xix. commences with the threat, and proceeds with the execution, of the final ruin of the power of the beast, assembled as his forces were from all quarters of the empire.

No one, now, well versed in the use of symbols and prophetic imagery, will think in this case of seeking for individual, minute, historical application of all that is exhibited in the symbols. The exhibition is so managed, that a consistency and concinnity is preserved throughout, for the sake of verisimilitude and in order to give pleasure to the reader. But no greater mistake can be made by the beholder of a picture, than that he should convert *back-ground* into *fore-ground*. What should we say, for example, of the critic on a well executed painting of the combat of Hector and Achilles, if he should aver, that the main object of the painter was, to present the Scamander and the plains of Troy, the distant forests, and the sky interspersed with clouds? We should say that he did not understand even the first elements of the art. All circumstances of this nature, even the walls of Troy surmounted by spectators among whom might be Priam and Hecuba and Andromache, and beyond these the Grecian and Trojan chieftains and armies—all,

all these are mere back-ground of such a picture, subordinate entirely to the main object, and serving only to make out a delightful verisimilitude. So is it in the Apocalypse. The apparent action of the symbols is in accordance with the nature of the symbols; while the *tout ensemble* is merely indicative of a great, a dangerous, a trying, and a long continued contest, which ends at last in a complete overthrow of the heathen power and all its coadjutors.

To make out, now, from such a *generic* representation by symbols, a succinct and individual history of the battles, sieges, famine, and various misfortunes, which overthrew the Roman power, would be doing just as they have done who make out a whole history of the fall and wickedness of man and of the scheme of redemption by a Saviour, from the parable of the good Samaritan. One may, if he pleases, look with complacency on the *intention* of the expositor who does this, but he cannot respect his understanding, nor approve of his taste, nor trust himself to such a guide. Why then should he admit an expositor to do that with the Apocalypse, which he would elsewhere consider an abuse of the sacred volume?

As to limitations of *time*, in regard to the first and second catastrophes, in the first they seem to be somewhat clearly marked, as occupying three and a half years; while in the second they are marked only by the destruction of the particular head of the beast then raging against the church, which also is to take place within the like period. *Facts* correspond to these limitations in both cases. We cannot stop for the proof of this here; the reader will find it in another place. But the *finale* of the second catastrophe, viewing this matter in all its bearings, is plainly represented as protracted to a more distant period.

When the enemies of Christianity throughout a great portion of the world are thus subdued, it follows of course that a time of peace and prosperity to the church will ensue. Such is the picture in the Apocalypse chap. xx. The representation is exceedingly brief, because the thing presented lies in the *distant* future; and in this respect the analogy of the prophecies in general is followed. But that such a period of prosperity and extension of the Messiah's kingdom was disclosed to the prophetic eye, even under the Jewish dispensation, any one may see who will take the trouble to review the prophecies adduced in § 2. above.

Yet there is one circumstance attending the introduction of this period, that recent exegesis admits to be deducible from the text of chap. xx, which is alleged to be entirely *unique*, and which therefore, it is said, must be regarded as merely imaginary, or as belonging merely to the poetic conception and excited imagination of the writer. It is that of the *first* resurrection, Rev. 20: 5, 6. I am aware, indeed, that this has often been asserted; and moreover, that in consequence of such a view of

what the passage would teach if it were literally interpreted, a majority of commentators have deemed it necessary to give to the whole passage a sense merely *figurative*. That there are some tropical expressions in it, such as "reigning with Christ," and "being priests unto God," must, no doubt, be plain to all. But these and the like occur in the midst of simple prose, and constitute no good argument against the exegesis which deduces from the whole passage the reality of a *first* resurrection; see full references to such figurative passages in Comm. on Rev.1: 6.

After investigating this subject, moreover, I have doubts whether the assertion is correct, that such a doctrine as that of the *first resurrection* is nowhere else to be found in the Scriptures. What can Paul mean, in Phil. 3: 8—11, when he represents himself as readily submitting to every kind of self-denial and suffering, "if by any means he might attain *unto the resurrection* of the dead?" Of his resurrection at the end of the world, when all without exception, even the wicked as well as the good, will surely be raised, he could have no possible doubt. What sense can this passage have then, if it represents him as labouring and suffering merely in order to attain to a resurrection, and as holding this up to view, by implication, as unattainable unless he should arrive at a high degree of Christian perfection? On the other hand; let us suppose a *first* resurrection to be appointed as a special reward of high attainments in Christian virtue, (exactly as in Rev. 20: 4—6), and all seems to be made plain and easy. Of a resurrection in a *figurative* sense, i. e. of *regeneration*, Paul cannot be speaking; for he had already attained to that on the plains of Damascus. Of the like tenor with this text, moreover, seems to be the implication in Luke 14: 14, where the Saviour promises his disciples a sure reward for kindness to the poor and the suffering, by the declaration: "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Why the resurrection of the *just*? What special meaning can this have, unless it implies that there is a resurrection, where the just only, and not the unjust, will be raised? This would agree entirely with the view in Rev. 20: 5, "But the rest of the dead *lived not again*, until the 1000 years were finished." There is the more reason to believe that such is the simple meaning of the words in Luke 14: 14, inasmuch as two recent antipodes in theology and criticism, Olshausen and De Wette, both agree in this exegesis. There are other passages, also, which are considerable in respect to number, that speak of the resurrection in respect to the *righteous*, and make no mention of that of the wicked. Some of these, at least, are susceptible of the same interpretation as that given above. In particular, what other satisfactory exegesis can we give to the ἀπαρχὴ . . . ἔπειτα . . . εἶτα of 1 Cor. 15: 23, 24, by which the apostle marks the respective τάγμα or order of each, and represents that which is at the end (τέλος) as different from the rest?

It is well known, I may add, that among the Jews the opinion was quite common, that whenever the full development of the Messiah should take place, there would be a resurrection of the just. They appear to have deduced this opinion from Is. 26: 19, (which no doubt describes a resurrection of some kind); from Ezek. xxxvii.; and from Dan. 12: 2. That this opinion is very old among the Jewish Rabbins, is clear from the fact, that their most ancient books speak to such a purpose. In the Zohar (Genes.) we find, among many other things respecting the resurrection, the following: "The Scripture says [Is. 26: 19], *Thy dead shall live;* they, namely, who are buried in the land of Israel. . . . Therefore those bodies are raised up, viz., of the Israelites who are buried there, but not the bodies of the idolatrous nations." The reference is to the period of the Messiah. Thus in another passage of the same work: "Our Rabbins have taught us, that in the times of the Messiah (לְעַתִּיד לָבֹא), the blessed God will restore to life the just, etc.," Zohar, Genes. fol. 61. See full quotations in Schoettgen, Hor. Heb. II. p. 572, 574. So Zohar, Genes. fol. 73: "The world cannot be freed from its guilt, until king Messiah shall come, and the blessed God shall raise up those who sleep in the dust;" (commenting on the expression, *he will swallow up death in victory*, Is. 25: 8). The same comment is made in Jalkuth Shimoni, I. fol. 188, and Shemoth Rabba, § 30. fol. 127. See Schoettg. II. p. 167. To the same purpose speaks the Targum of Jonathan, as quoted by Wetstein on Rev. 20: 8; and Maimonides testifies that the opinion of many Rabbins is the same, as quoted by Lightfoot on John 6: 31. In fact, that the great mass of Jewish Rabbins have believed and taught the doctrine of *the resurrection of the just*, in the days of the Messiah's development, there can be no doubt on the part of him who has made any considerable investigation of this matter.* The specific limitation of this to the commencement of the Millenium, seems to be peculiar to John.

No one must understand me, however, as appealing to Rabbinic authority in order to establish the doctrine of a *first* resurrection. All that I design to accomplish by such an appeal is, to show that such a doctrine was not a strange one to the Jews. We cannot say with certainty, that the book of Zohar is as ancient as the Apocalypse; but the prevailing opinion among critics seems now to be, that it belongs at least to the early ages of the Christian era, although it has some interpolations of a much later date. If so, it seems quite probable that when

* The reader who is desirous of pursuing this investigation still further, is referred to Corrodi, Geschichte des Chiliasmus, I. § 16, p. 345 seq. Süskind über die Jüdischen Begriffe, etc., in Flatt's Magazin für Dogmatik und Moral, St. X. p. 104 seq. De Wette, Bib. Dogmatik, § 203. § 304. § 188. Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, Vol. II. cap. XVI. p. 890 seq.

John proclaimed a *first* resurrection, he would be regarded by the men of his time as free from any imputation of broaching novelties in this respect. The laws of philology oblige me to suppose, that the Saviour and Paul have both alluded to such a doctrine. That it has not been made more *prominent* in the New Testament, is no decisive objection against it. Where but in 1 Cor. 15: 24—28 have we an account of Christ's resignation of his *kingly* power? Where but in 1 Cor. 6: 2, 3, are we told that "saints shall judge the world, and judge angels?" And are these truths to be discarded, because they are no oftener brought to view and insisted on? On such ground, what must become of the authority and infallibility of scriptural teaching? Moreover it is obvious, that the *final* resurrection, *general* judgment, and the consequent distribution of rewards and punishments, are things of higher moment and deeper interest in many respects, than the resurrection of the *just only* at the commencement of the Millennium; which is a good reason for more frequently insisting upon the former. Nor should it be forgotten, that even the Old Testament contains some passages which may very naturally be applied to the Messianic or first resurrection, e. g. Is. 26: 19.

If there be any good foundation for what has now been said, it follows, that so far as the first resurrection and the millennial period of prosperity to the church are concerned, they are not to be regarded as mere poetic conceptions, i. e. as the drapery only of the Apocalypse, but as *facts* which the writer designed to bring to view in a most interesting connection and relation.

In respect to the three verses (Rev. 20: 7—9) which bring to view GOG and MAGOG, they plainly belong to the very distant future. Nothing but general ideas can be gathered from them. That the millennial period will not bring about the conversion of the whole human race without exception, is evident from the very face of the entire statement. That the enemies of Christianity, who will come forth to assault her at the end of the thousand years, will be numerous, will come from the remoter and hitherto inaccessible parts of the earth, and will be overthrown speedily and with terrible destruction, is decided by Rev. 20: 7—9. But this is all that we can gather from the text respecting the matter. *Gog* and *Magog* are plainly symbolical names merely; and symbols also are the designations of *the camp of the saints*, and *the beloved city*, and probably *the fire from God out of heaven*. The facts which lie at the basis, as I apprehend them, are such as have just been stated.

As to the subjects of the remainder of the Apocalypse, it requires but little more delay in order to accomplish our present general view. The GENERAL JUDGMENT, HELL, HEAVEN, are to be found as described or adverted to in all parts of the New Testament. The Saviour has plainly

enough declared all these; see John 5: 21—30. 14: 3. Matt. 25: 31—46, and many other passages; and as to Paul and Peter, no quotations need to be made. Even the final destruction of the world is not a doctrine peculiar to the Apocalypse. Peter affirms it in plain words, 2 Pet. 3: 12, 13; and the *new heavens* and the *new earth* are not only disclosed by him, but even by Isaiah in 65: 17. 66: 22. John has indeed adorned this last idea in a wonderful manner, in Rev. xxi. xxii.; but all this symbolical imagery is in perfect keeping with the tenor of the Apocalypse, and much of it tallies well with Ezekiel, xl—xlviii. The reality of *new* abodes for resurrection-saints, and resurrection-sinners also, may well be argued from the new mode of existence on which both classes enter.

My object thus far has been principally to show, that *substantial facts* lie at the basis of the Apocalypse, and that this basis is not a mere imaginary or poetic conception. On this John has indeed erected a new and splendid edifice, adorned in many ways, and especially with ornaments suited to the oriental taste. This is in keeping with the country and the culture of the author. His Epopee, like most other productions that bear such a name, has its foundation in *facts* and *truths* which are of high importance. We might even say of John's work, that it is founded on truths of the highest possible significance and importance, not only to the churches then in being, but to those of every age and nation.

So far now as these are essentially concerned, imagination and poetic fancy have nothing to do. The truths are assumed and declared plainly and unequivocally. They constitute, if one may so express it, the PERSON. A secondary question, and one the next in order, is, *What constitutes the* DRAPERY *or* COSTUME? To the consideration of this subject or question we must now proceed.

All symbol is of course *drapery*. It is the *thing signified* which is *person;* but the way and manner of signifying it, when imagery and symbols are employed, is merely the fashion of the costume. How has John managed these? What credit is due to him, if he be exhibited on the theatre of aesthetics? What rank does he hold as to fancy, and imagination, and descriptive style, and arrangement, and skill in the disposal of all the machinery (sit venia!) of the piece?

A long and laboured account of these matters will not be expected in this place. It belongs to the commentary to point out and disclose particulars. But some general views of these subjects should find a place here, nor are they by any means unimportant.

I pass the proem or prelude (i—ii.), with but few remarks. It will be conceded, I trust, that the lonely isle of Patmos, the exile of the writer because of his Christian fidelity, and the Lord's day on which the revelations are made, are all highly appropriate and interesting cir-

cumstances, in respect to the visions which follow. The attention, in such circumstances, must be undivided, fixed, solemn, deep. The Christophany in chap. i. is confessedly a splendid and sublime exhibition. The fact (in vision) is assumed. The *manner* of it serves to adorn, to beautify, to impress.

The tone which pervades the epistles to the churches, the high spirituality of the whole sentiment, the demands of sincere and entire devotedness of heart and life, the reproof of faults which is at once both kind and severe, the glorious promises in order to cheer on the martyrs who were suffering for the truth, the rich variety of description in setting forth the rewards to be obtained, the appropriate circumstances that are in each case introduced, the regularity of the *trichotomy* through the whole, and yet the concealment of it so that few readers think of its existence —these, and other things of the like nature, might all be mentioned as characteristics of the epistles to the seven churches of Asia.

But let us proceed to the main work itself. The commencement of it is in a style truly magnificent. Heaven is opened to the spiritual and mental eye of the seer, and he is conveyed thither. On an exalted throne there, sits One whose name is too awful, at the first view, to be pronounced. Lightning, thunder, the archangels, the elders of the church, the redeemed, and angels without number, surround the throne. Four living creatures, capable of moving in any direction, and in an instant of time, support it. The innumerable host of the world of light fall prostrate before him who is enthroned, with the deepest reverence, and fill the heavens with ascriptions of praise and honour and glory.

I know of nothing that surpasses this, unless it be, that Is. vi. has attained to more complete brevity. But who would lose a single circumstance which John has added? In truth, John has here combined the several theophanies in Ezek. i, Is. vi, and Dan. vii, into one; which still is no imitation, but clearly the result of his own conceptions.

The *object* of the vision comes next into view. THE FUTURE CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH, as yet one of the deep mysteries of God, are to be disclosed. In the right hand of him that sitteth on the throne appears a book, on whose pages these mysteries are inscribed—a book sealed with seven seals. No one of all the heavenly host can open and read it, or divine its meaning. The seer bursts into tears because it cannot be perused. The Lamb of God next makes his appearance within the inner circle around the throne. He advances and takes the book. All heaven burst forth into a song of congratulation and joy. Salvation and glory and victory are ascribed to the Lamb; and this song is echoed and reëchoed to the most distant parts of the universe. Chap. v.

The breaking of the seals, and the disclosure of what the book con-

tains, now follow in order. Is this by *pictures* or *symbols* drawn upon the pages of the book, or by pictures in part, and partly by language? The latter seems the most probable, inasmuch as the book is described as being *γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν*. But be it in either of these ways, disclosure is made, and the representation is exceedingly vivid. A persecuting and powerful enemy of the church is to be arrested and destroyed. Forthwith, therefore, a dread array appears, which is competent to the execution of such a task. The breaking of the first seal exhibits the leader of the army, with all the insignia of triumph around him. The second discloses the symbol of an army glittering with the instruments of slaughter. The third introduces into the train famine with its ravages and distresses. The fourth brings up the rear of this awful host with Death on his pale horse, and Hades, i. e. the spectre-world, as following in his train in order to execute his will.

Such is the array commissioned against the persecuting enemies of the church. All seems to be now ready for action. But first, this marshalled host, drawn out for battle, are to be wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement before the onset. The manner in which this is accomplished presents one of the most exquisite scenes to be found in any writing, either sacred or profane. The bleeding martyrs who have already fallen are seen, at the opening of the fifth seal, lying at the foot of the altar in heaven, as indicative of their having been the victims of slaughter. There, with blood streaming around, they lift up their cry to him 'in whose sight the death of his saints is precious,' and ask with elevated voice how long the retributions of justice on their murderers are to be delayed. Robes of glory are given to them, and they receive assurance, that after a little season all will be accomplished which they desire. A scene like this cannot be imagined to have been exhibited, without supposing the army who were assembled to have been wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement for the contest. The commanders of great armies are wont to devise some rallying word or signal, at the moment when the onset of battle is made. The ear has not yet ceased to vibrate, nor the heart ceased from thrilling, with the signal hoisted at the moment of attack on board the admiral-ship of him who led the van in the greatest naval battle that was ever fought. That signal was: ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY. Every man did it, and in a few hours the enemy were no more. But the sight of bleeding martyrs at the foot of the altar on which they appeared to have been sacrificed, was a more thrilling signal than even this. And with such a sight the dread array commissioned by heaven was presented. Chap. vi.

We no longer wonder at the sequel. The sixth seal presents us with new symbols of heaven's righteous indignation against the persecutors. The sun and moon are eclipsed. Falling stars fill the world with con-

sternation. Earthquakes swallow up islands and overthrow mountains. The inhabitants of the land to be smitten fly to rocks and precipices, to hide themselves in their crevices and find security. All stand in fearful expectation of their final doom. 6: 12—17.

Before that doom arrives, however, the faithful servants of God, who are scattered through the land, must be rendered secure. The tempest, which had shaken the earth to its centre, is stilled. Angels are now commissioned to put a mark on the servants of God. Twelve thousand of each and every tribe are sealed. Heaven is filled with joy at this, and praise and thanksgiving burst forth from all around the throne of God. Conspicuous among these are the martyrs, clothed in their resplendent robes. John inquires with deep interest respecting these; and he receives assurances, that every kind of blessing and happiness awaits them. Chap. vii.

All seems now to be ready for consummation. The seventh and last seal is about to be broken. The hosts of heaven stand, for a time, in mute and fearful expectation. But instead of the speedy final execution of justice, God's mercy toward his once beloved and chosen people is here disclosed. Still further opportunity is given them to repent. The seventh seal introduces seven angels, each having a *trumpet*, which they are to blow in regular succession. It is thus that the last seal becomes, as to the execution of what it develops, disparted into seven different portions, which must occupy some time in their appropriate disclosure.

Of these seven trumpets, there is a division into two classes, one of *four*, and the other of *three*. The first four introduce various phenomena, which principally affect, in the way of injury, the earth, the sea, the rivers and fountains of water, and the luminaries of the sky. The enemy are subjected, in this way, to various sufferings and distress, but as yet only a few comparatively are destroyed. Chap. viii.

Not so with the last three *woe-trumpets*. The first of these brings unnumbered legions of locusts from the bottomless pit, with the angel of destruction at their head. These locusts are not of the ordinary kind. They touch not the vegetation of the earth; for they are commissioned only to wound and torment men. Their teeth are sharp and terrible, and their stings like those of scorpions. When these have fulfilled their period, then follows the sounding of the *sixth* trumpet, and a host of 200,000,000 of horsemen advance from the East. It is not the number only which fills us with astonishment, in this case; it is specially the *qualities* of the horses. The riders indeed are armed with panoply that fills the beholder with terror; but the horses themselves have mouths like lions, and tails like the amphisbaena, i. e. capable of inflicting wounds. Great multitudes are destroyed by such an invasion; yet those who remain, still continue impenitent as before. Chap. ix.

If there be any part of the Apocalypse where the writer is exposed to the charge of carrying his imagery to *excess*, it is certainly the one now before us. The locusts and the horses are both objects of imagination merely, not actual existences. Natural locusts do not attack men; nor to horses belong teeth like those of lions, nor two heads like the amphisbaena. Yet what shall we say? Shall we assume, that in a symbolical picture like that of John, everything must be a mere copy of actual existences? What writer of Epopee ever confined himself within such limits? In the book of Job even—does the war-horse there, and behemoth, and the leviathan, play only actual and every-day parts? And if John be allowed to go beyond the bounds of real and actual existences, in order to adorn or render impressive his composition, why may he not follow his imagination out, and present all the glowing pictures which it portrays? It is plain and well known, that locusts and cavalry were the two greatest and most terrible scourges known in all the East, at the time when John wrote. Why then may he not present them here, in accordance with the genius of oriental poetry, endowed with preternatural forms and armed with extraordinary powers? To do this, is no more than all epic poets have done. Yet the imagery even of the destructive horses is not so entirely fanciful as one might at first suppose. It is well known, that in the East, (as at the present day, for example, among the Turcomans), horses are trained to attack with their mouths and fore-feet, as also to repel with their hinder feet and the swift motion of their tails. Fraser has presented this, in a manner very picturesque, in that faithful and animated portrait of Turcomans and Persians, which he has drawn in his *Kuzzil Bash*. And as to the *locusts*, surely it required no great transformation, to turn them into creatures like scorpions. It is an easy and obvious conception.

It should be noted here, moreover, in respect to the supposition that the armies of locusts and horsemen were represented to John by *paintings*, i. e. by the drawing of sketches upon the pages of the book with seven seals, that this seems to be out of all reasonable question, inasmuch as it appears to be impossible; and so of the *thunders*, and of many other things that belong to the first catastrophe. The probability appears to be, that John is to be regarded as only *reading* the description upon the leaves of the opened book, or as hearing it from his angel-interpreter; just as he heard the number of the horsemen, Rev. 9: 16. More probable still it seems to my own mind, that John saw, on the leaves of the book, either certain symbols, or words, which suggested ideas that led his own mind to form its conceptions of the locusts and of the horsemen. Terrible sufferings and wide-spreading destruction are plainly the *matters of fact* that lie at the basis of such a representation. Of the representation itself, after the explanation just given, it is enough

to say, that it is oriental—altogether oriental. And why should it not be so, when it was written by an oriental man, and addressed originally to oriental readers?

But let us proceed with the writer's further execution of his plan. One woe-trumpet still remains; and all which is to be done as preparatory to this, must now be accomplished.

A resplendent and mighty angel takes his station upon the sea and the land, as having power over both, and lifts up his hand to heaven, and swears that *delay shall be no longer*, than until the time when the last or seventh trumpet shall sound. Seven thunders confirm the sentence passed. In the mean time, as the contents of the book with seven seals will now soon be completed, John receives another book, and a *new commission*, so as to extend his predictions to foreign kings and nations. Chap. x.

The city "where our Lord was crucified," is about to be destroyed. There was the temple of God; and there, in former days he had dwelt. The *most holy place* is therefore measured off for exemption from destruction; i. e. the *spiritual* part of the ancient dispensation is still to be preserved. And as the last and consummating act of wickedness on the part of Jewish persecutors and unbelievers, God's faithful witnesses, the prophets, who preached Christ and performed many miracles, are persecuted, slain, and exposed to all possible indignities. But heaven saves and vindicates the cause of truth, and makes it triumphant.

All is now ready. The righteous are safe; the holy of holies is safe; the Jewish people have consummated their wickedness and guilt. The seventh and last trumpet sounds. The shouts of victory in heaven fill the ears and occupy the mind of the Seer, and turn away his attention from the sad spectacle of the overthrow of his beloved city and people. Thunder and lightning and earthquake and hail complete the work of destruction. The old dispensation comes to an end. The most holy place is now thrown open; and God, who could be nearly approached, in former days, only once a year by the high priest, is henceforth approachable by all, at all times and in all places.

Thus ends the *first catastrophe;* in which chap. vii. x. and xi. 1—14, may be regarded as *episodes*, interwoven indeed with great skill into the main theme of this catastrophe. Here is much exercise of imagination in the choice of symbols, great powers of description by vivid impressive language and imagery, and great variety of action which excites a deep and fearful interest in the reader. Can any candid reader deny merit to a piece executed in such a manner? But of the aesthetics, more in the sequel.

We come now to the *second catastrophe.* Here too, as in the first, is a proem or prologue. It is not a Theophany, nor a Christophany in the

like sense with that in chap. i. It is however a symbolical representation of the *Logos becoming incarnate.* From the bosom of the church he comes, as to his fleshly or mortal nature. Here, as often in the Old Testament and many times in the New, the church is represented under the emblem of a *woman.* It is not the church merely as Jewish, certainly not the church as Christian (which was subsequent), but the church as beloved of God and always the object of his care and love, which is symbolized as the mother of "the Man-child who is to rule the nations with an iron sceptre" (Rev. 12: 5). Like the bride in Ps. 45: 13, she is adorned with great splendour. Sun, moon, and stars unite in shedding their glory around her. She is introduced as being pregnant with the child who is to be the great King, and Satan is presented as her violent and persecuting enemy. He stands ready to devour the child at its birth. But the woman is protected by a watchful providence, and flees into the wilderness where she finds an asylum from Satan's vengeance. Chap. xii.

The history of Mary, the cruel designs of Herod when he massacred the children at Bethlehem, and the flight of the infant Saviour's parents to Egypt, through the wilderness, must all have been floating before the mind of the writer, when he drew this picture. His meaning is rendered too specific, by the declaration: "She brought forth a son who is to rule the nations with an iron sceptre" (Ps. 2: 9), to admit of any room for doubt as to the general design of this proem to the second catastrophe.

Mere glances at the Saviour's history are given. "He is caught up unto God;" and Satan, full of rage, attempts to follow him into the upper regions. But there Michael and his angels meet him in contest, and thrust him and his legions down to the earth. Disappointed in his hopes as to the great Head of the church, he now turns his enmity against the other children of the woman, i. e. the members of the Christian church.

It is thus that the writer introduces us to the second great contest and catastrophe. For the moment, his steps have been *regressive.* We may now expect them to be *progressive.*

I cannot stop to remark here on the additional interest which the writer thus throws around his theme, by pointing out the ground and origin of Satan's peculiar enmity against Christianity. It is as much as to say: See what bitter and bloody persecutions the church is still to expect!

To constitute a complete association of inimical powers, two other adversaries, in league with Satan and under his guidance, are next brought upon the scene, and made to take an active and bitterly hostile part. A beast rises from the sea, with seven heads and ten horns, (em-

blems of great power and of offensive attack), in which are united all the savage qualities of the most ferocious beasts. To him Satan gives ample power, and through him receives much tribute of homage. This beast is not only blasphemous against God, but it persecutes the saints in every form, and with every kind of oppression both civil and religious. All but the truly faithful are compelled to do it homage.

A second beast arises from the land, not armed with a power like that of the first beast, but with craftiness and superstition and deep malignity. All manner of deceit is practised in order to mislead the faithful, and all manner of oppression and cruelty (by means of the power of the first beast) in order to force them to do homage to idols.

The name of these deadly powers is not expressly given. It is intimated, however, at the close of the brief sketch which is given of them, that the name of the principal beast, if computed in the usual manner of reckoning letters for numbers, will amount to 666. The reasons for speaking mystically here, I shall endeavour to give in the Commentary on Rev. 13: 18, and the Excursus connected with it. Chap. xiii.

Thus we have before us, Satan, the beast, and the false prophet or second beast, in combination against an apparently feeble Christian church. How can it escape destruction, when the civil and sacerdotal powers of the earth, and the prince of the spirits of darkness, are leagued against it?

No sooner, however, is all this fairly placed before the reader, than he is led to a prospect of hope for the suffering church, notwithstanding this combination of mighty and seemingly irresistible enemies against her. The first signal or symbol which inspires hope, is the appearance on mount Zion of the 144,000, who had been sealed in their forehead and exempted from the dangers that awaited them in the Jewish land. Not on mount Zion *above*, as many have supposed, but on mount Zion *below*, once the central point of the Jewish church, and dangerous ground for Christians. There stand the *redeemed*, while the sound of songs in the heavenly world, uttered on their account, is heard by them—songs which none but the faithful like themselves can understand. The fidelity and the purity of these redeemed followers of the Lamb are eulogized in such a manner, as strongly to invite others to an imitation of their virtues.

There seems, at first sight, to be a kind of *ὕστερον πρότερον* in the plan here proposed. Nero began to persecute Christians in A. D. 64, and was assassinated in A. D. 68; in which last year the Apocalypse appears to have been written. But Jerusalem was not taken and destroyed, until A. D. 70. How can John be supposed to have represented the 144,000 as saved and redeemed, *before* the destruction of Jerusalem which happened some two years after the time when he wrote?

The answer to this is, that Christians were most fully warned by Christ, (Matt. xxiv. and elsewhere), to flee to the mountains as soon as the Roman army advanced upon Palestine. Doubtless the great body of them did so. The invasion was early in A. D. 67; and it seems quite probable, that ere John wrote the Apocalypse, the great body of Christians had fled beyond the Jordan to Pella, and were safe. That he presents them on *mount Zion*, belongs to the tact of the writer. He presents them in vision merely to the eye of the beholder, as entirely safe amid the most dangerous and powerful enemies of Christianity in the holy land. The station that is assigned them in the vision, is a symbol or pledge that they are safe, even in the very place where their blood had so often and so profusely been shed.

Such then is the first and most significant symbol of the future victory of the persecuted church. The second is triplex and is scarcely less significant. Through mid-heaven a herald-angel flies, proclaiming that the gospel will of a certainty be preached to every creature, and exhorting to worship God alone, and not idols. A second angel proclaims the fall of great Babylon. A third follows, and explicitly declares the severe punishment of all who shall cleave to her and obey her. As an epiphonema, a voice from heaven itself proclaims, on the other hand, the peace and glory that await those who die in the Lord.

Thus the second symbol is presented by *words* or *proclamations*. The third consists of a series of symbols by *actions*. The Redeemer appears seated on a shining cloud, with a sharp sickle in his hand. An angel from the throne of the Eternal brings him a request to thrust in the sickle and reap. This is done. A second angel from the temple in heaven appears, armed with a sharp weapon. A third angel from the altar above brings a request, that he would thrust the weapon into the vintage, and cut off the clusters. This is done, and they are cast into a great wine-press, and blood flows out to the distance of a thousand and six hundred furlongs. Chap. xiv.

Such then are the symbols of the future destiny of the persecuting enemy. These being exhibited, immediate action follows. To seven angels are committed seven vials filled with the wrath of God, in order to discharge them upon the enemy. The song of anticipated victory follows, which is sung by the martyrs in heaven. The seven vials are distributed, and dark clouds surround the throne of glory. As before in respect to the trumpets, so here in respect to the vials; they are divided into classes of *four* and *three*. The vials are next successively poured out upon the earth, the sea, the fountains and rivers of water, and upon the sun, i. e. the heavens. The last three vials have a near connection with the destruction of *men*. The fifth, poured upon the seat of the beast, produces darkness upon the land, and grievous ulcera-

tions upon men. The sixth, poured on the Euphrates, opens a way for the armies of an invading enemy. The beast and his coadjutors assemble their forces at *Armageddon;* whose very name itself is indicative of their overthrow. The seventh, poured on the atmosphere, the seat and cause of storms and tempests, brings on lightning, thunder, earthquake, and destructive hail. Babylon is shaken and disrupted, and becomes like a mass of ruins; as do also the other great cities of the allies confederate with her. Yet even plagues like these did not cure the madness of the church's foes. Chap. xv. xvi.

The writer now provides, by the introduction of an episode, that the reader shall be made more explicitly acquainted with the enemies that have been assailed and defeated. In vision, John is rapt into the wilderness, where he sees a woman sitting upon a scarlet beast having seven heads and ten horns. This is the symbol of the bloody and persecuting power that reigns over the nations; and the woman is the great city which is at the head of the dominion, who is drunk with the blood of martyrs, and entices all the nations with her magic-cup of abominations. The characteristics are made out in view of the then reigning emperor, Nero. Of him the soothsayers had predicted, that he would be assassinated; but also that he would recover from his wounds and go into exile, from which he would return and resume his former power. In accordance with the tenor of this report which was generally circulated and believed, he is described by John, as "the beast that was, and is not, and will come up from the abyss;" and further, as 'being an *eighth*, and yet one of the *seven* emperors of Rome.' The description is, no doubt, in some measure designedly enigmatical, in order to avoid the imputation of a seditious attack upon the reigning power. But the *seven hills*, symbolized by the seven heads of the beast; and the *seven kings* also symbolized by the same heads, (one of which kings is yet to come), seem to render certain the time when the Apocalypse was composed, and the country and dominion to which the writer adverts. The *ten horns* are symbols of allied and subordinate kings, who unite with the beast in carrying on the persecution of the church. But these will ultimately turn against the beast, and help to destroy it. Chap. xvii.

It is thus that John has fulfilled his very difficult and delicate task of informing his readers what his principal aim was, in the second catastrophe. Complaint has sometimes been made, that the explanation is darker than the symbols which precede it. This has apparently some foundation; for chap. xvii. may certainly be numbered among the most difficult of all in the Apocalypse. Yet I cannot help thinking, that this is to be attributed to two circumstances; first, the distance of time, which has rendered obscure to us the hints of the writer that were in all probability well understood at first; and secondly, the extreme difficulty and

danger, both to the writer and readers, of speaking out plainly and directly. It would at once have been construed as a *crimen laesae majestatis*, on the part of both. John would have been condemned for writing it, and his readers for approving of it. Hence the enigmatical expressions in chap. xvii, which only the initiated could well comprehend and explain; but which, when duly comprehended, seem to leave no room for rational doubt as to the meaning of John.

The overthrow which great Babylon had experienced is followed, at last, by her complete and final destruction. The people of God are warned by a mighty angel to flee from her who has so long corrupted the nations, because ample and final retribution is about to be made. In anticipation of this, the *Lament* to be sung over her is introduced, as an evidence how complete her destruction will be. It exhibits expressions of wonder and horror, on the part of kings and merchants and seamen, who had been connected with her and thrived in riches by their intercourse with her. To put the final seal upon her doom, an angel presents the symbol of a huge mill-stone, elevated and cast into the depths of the ocean, while he declares that such shall be her fate. Chap. xviii.

Forthwith the shout of anticipated final victory rings through all the heavenly world; which is thrice repeated. Immediately the King of kings and Lord of lords appears at the head of the heavenly armies, and marches forth to the great battle of God almighty. The rapacious beasts and birds are summoned from every quarter to glut themselves on the corpses of the slain. The armies meet. The beast and false prophet are taken alive, and cast into the lake of fire and brimstone; and Satan is apprehended by a mighty angel, put in chains, and shut up in the great abyss for a thousand years. Chap. xix. xx. 1—3.

Thus ends the *second catastrophe*. The heathen powers, which had so long and bitterly persecuted the church, are put down and wholly subdued, and the church of God now enjoys a long season of prosperity and peace, and diffuses itself over a great portion of the earth.

A sketch of this diffusion and prosperity (20: 4—6) forms a brief proem to the third catastrophe; thus varying the manner of the writer on former occasions of the like nature. Yet here the *distant* future only comes into view, and everything is executed by a simple outline.

Satan, being loosed at the end of the thousand years, brings up Gog and Magog, in number like the sands of the sea, against the camp of the saints and their beloved metropolis. Fire falls from heaven and consumes the host of the enemy, and Satan is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone; 20: 7—10.

It is plain, that the writer's *main* object has been completed antecedently to this last scene. Yet the *trichotomy* of the book, and the nature of the case, both demanded a rounding off of the whole in such a

way. The final triumphant—universally triumphant—position of the church is thus exhibited; and the reader's mind would have been less satisfied, had this been omitted.

I cannot doubt, when the nature of the case and the plan of the writer are considered, that an interval is to follow between the destruction of the last enemies of the church and the end of the world—a long interval, in which many sons and daughters will be born to the Lord Almighty. It is in this way, and in this only, that we can conceive of the entire fulfilment of the promise, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head." In the Messianic portions of the Old Testament, any attentive reader will perceive numerous passages, where similar intervals must beyond all doubt be supposed to exist, in order to explain the phenomena when they are comprehensively viewed. The old age of the world is doubtless to be peaceful and glorious, when Satan and all his instruments of mischief shall cease to annoy the church.

The *final* destiny of the church triumphant still remains; and the climactic course of the Epopee renders it inexpedient to omit this. Accordingly, the general resurrection and judgment are briefly introduced, followed by a sketch of ultimate punishments and rewards. The former are barely touched, but still they are touched with a master's hand; 20: 14, 15. The latter are dwelt upon with all the interest and rapture which their nature and excellence demand. A new heaven and a new earth appear. The new Jerusalem comes forth in all the splendour of the upper world, a dwelling place fit for the habitation of God and his saints. In describing its ornaments and glories, the writer follows close in the steps of Ezekiel (xl—xlviii.) in some respects; in others, he differs so much as to show that he was no mere imitator. A splendid description has he given us, and one adapted in all respects to excite intense interest in the mind of the Christian reader.

An epilogue, in which the certainty of the things promised and predicted and the value and inviolability of the book are graphically set forth, concludes the work.

I have called this work an *Epopee*, because it has all the leading qualities of such a work—continued action of the deepest interest, wonderful actors, great events, much display of imagination and fancy, poetry in respect to its conceptions and diction, a general unity of design, and catastrophes of higher import and more thrilling interest than all the catastrophes of other epics united. It is useless to dispute about *names*; but I do not see how any one can show the impropriety of the name that I have employed, merely from the fact that circumstantially the Apocalypse differs from the Iliad, the Aeneid, or the Paradise Lost. I allow that it is an Epopee *sui generis*,—a great *moral* Epopee—in which

are celebrated, not the deeds of an Achilles or of an Aeneas with their associates, but of the King of kings and Lord of lords with his angels and saints.

§ 11. *Aesthetical character of the Apocalypse.*

And now, what rhetorical judgment shall we pass upon the plan of the writer and his execution of it? I am well aware, that those who have but one measure which they can apply to all Epopees, and this a measure that has been adjusted by the Iliad and the Aeneid, or by the Paradise Lost, will find but a moderate share of beauty and excellence in the style and composition of the Apocalypse. But I take the liberty boldly to protest against such a rule of judgment. It is neither equitable nor liberal. Has there been no other standard of excellence ever raised, except that which floats over the Iliad and the Aeneid? I most readily concede the aesthetic excellence of these productions, in their own way. But other minds have thought, and felt, and composed with excellence, besides those of Homer and Virgil. The Revelation of John is indeed an *oriental*, and not an occidental, performance. It is specially adapted, as we should naturally expect, to the taste of oriental readers. But why should we not make all due allowance for this? Isaiah is oriental too; but who in all the West, or in any other region, has reached the sublimity and beauty of his strains? And should we not, in deciding upon the execution of the plan of the Apocalypse and its aesthetical merit, first make ourselves familiar with the feelings and views and conceptions of the East? Common and impartial justice would insist upon this. And when tried by an appropriate measure, John need not shrink from a comparison with any other writer.

Who are his *actors?* God; Christ; the blessed angels; the spirits of the just made perfect; Satan and all the powers of darkness; the church on earth, labouring, suffering, contending, pouring out its martyr-blood; the cruel and persecuting Jews; the atrocious Nero, that incarnate fiend, who swayed the empire of the world, bade nations lie prostrate at his feet, and trampled upon and tore limb from limb every follower of Christ with whom he could meet; and finally, the innumerable hosts of Gog and Magog from the ends of the earth, who encompass the camp and city of the saints.

What is *accomplished?* The subjugation and utter destruction of all enemies—of the Jews—of the heathen Romish persecutors—of the more distant and barbarous heathen. The little, persecuted, despised church, commencing with scarcely more than could assemble in a moderate house, extends, and extends, and waxes powerful, and becomes victorious, until the world is filled with its triumphs and its peaceful dominion.

And what is the *prize* of the victors in such a contest? Peace and prosperity on earth, and thrones and crowns of glory in the world to come.

In this great contest the weal or woe of all our race, even through ages that have no end, is concerned. Never was such a contest; never such defeats on the one hand, nor such victories on the other, as the Apocalypse exhibits. Its theme surpasses that of any and all other epics, as much as the moral and spiritual nature of man rises above his physical being, or the interests of eternity surpass those of time.

Such is the view, that a long acquaintance with the Apocalypse and examinations of it often repeated have led me to form. I cannot decide for others; but I may take it for granted, that they will not deny to me the privilege of frankly giving my own opinion and the reasons for it.

Nor am I alone in my aesthetical views of this book. Others who have devoted much time to the study of it, have viewed it in a similar light. Little more than sixty years ago, the credit of the Apocalypse among the Protestant churches on the continent of Europe stood very low. Oeder and Semler had attacked it with great violence, and even bitterness, both in respect to its canonical authority and its style. As their neological views respecting the Scriptures generally, were soon extensively adopted in Germany, the credit of the Apocalypse had sunk to such a degree, that it was hardly deemed worthy of any strenuous effort in order to explain it.

In this state of things Herder, who knew so well how to beautify and adorn everything that interested him, took the book in hand. His little volume which he called *Maran Atha* (the Lord will come) contains a brief commentary on the Revelation, with a version; and these are followed by an Essay on the plan, the style, the idiom, and the authorship of the book, with remarks on its original and present use and value. Nothing which Herder has written more fully displays his talents, than this short piece. His soul was filled with the visions of the Apocalyptist, and he has poured forth its ample streams in the *Critique* which he has composed.

He speaks first of the *language* of the Hebrew prophets, after which that of the Apocalypse is modelled. "They have," says he, "all one spirit, one design. One builds on another; one explains another; and as gold have all been preserved. No imagery-language has remained purer, or been better preserved; none is in any measure so deeply imbedded in the genius of the people, its writings, and its idiom. Hebrew poetry is as it were all symbol, imagery, holy and lofty diction. Even the prose-writers and historians must needs speak in a tropical way, because their language demands it; still more must this be done by

teachers and prophets. No language loves and furnishes imagery like this. Here a fiery glance, there a breathing full of the spirit of the Lord. In this way speak the Old and New Testament; and so speaks the Apocalypse which contains the sum of both. It is an anile fable, that a peculiar key belongs to it, or that the key is lost. Whoever writes a book without an adequate key? Specially, who writes such an one for seven churches? Did John attach a peculiar key to it, when he sent it to them? How did it look? Who has seen it? How came it to be lost? Is it in the sea near Patmos, or in the Maeander? John writes a book for others—for many; a book about whose contents he was so seriously anxious, that he arrays curse upon curse against any one who detracts from it, and blessing upon blessing for him who reads, hears, and obeys it; and yet this book is said to be an unintelligible enigma, a kind of raving wholly sealed up, which no one except its author can understand, and which even he himself perhaps did not understand. Can anything be more absurd? But if it was intelligible to Christians of that day, why not to us who have the Old Testament, and the written testimony of Jesus, and the history to which this book has reference? They lived amid the distresses of the times; they must needs wait for the fulfilment of what was predicted, and therefore could look upon the contents of the book only in the dimness of the future; we live 1700 years after them, and in the most lucid era of history. Is the book fulfilled, (for it declares that its fulfilment will be *soon*, *quickly*, *without delay*), then history must show its fulfilment." Maran Atha, p. 240 seq.

Thus much in respect to the figurative language of the book and its alleged obscurity. The author proceeds, in a variety of ways, to exhibit and defend the *diction* and *plan* of the Apocalypse, with much ingenuity and eloquence. In the sequel he remarks: "According to the date given in the Apocalypse itself, it was the earliest work of John. . . . To me it seems, that the style partakes of the most manly youthful vigour of his mind. The language is here and there unconformed to grammatical rule. But who does not know that all the language of prophecy is full of this daring strength—of this lofty contempt of formal rules? The gods do not speak like men; for even the heathen, in the way of art, imitated what was a higher nature in the prophets—inspiration."

"But leaving the province of Grammar . . . who is there that does not feel the *divine* (*θεῖον*) of this book? Who does not even find the book peculiar in this respect? I know of more than one, who does not pretend to any intimate knowledge of its contents, and certainly would undergo no martyrdom in defence of them, who still finds what he does understand to be beautiful, and the whole costume and series of the im-

agery to be expanded and noble. Flower-wreaths from the poetry of prophecy adorn the contents of this book, as fine linen does the bride, as the heavenly cloud envelops the angel. Should I indulge myself in the easy task of gathering parallel passages from the heathen poets, the most powerful passages of imagery, either of Greeks or Romans, when they speak of lustrations, consecrations, mysteries, theophanies, and oracles, might be arrayed in the huge train of a victory-show. Yet I have still to say: Here is a country, a town, a sanctuary cleansed by fire. On this spot there shoots up, in the sacred councils of heaven, the ark of the covenant, manna, the temple, white garments, the golden branch of the tree of life, the tetradic number, the new inheritance, the new mysterious Name, the Morning Star—all symbols of hidden and mysterious things. The consecrated have passed through a sea of trial; they bear palm-branches in their hands; within the inner sanctuary of his temple, they sing a song which others cannot learn. . . . What selection of scraps from foreign poets could come in here, in order to give the book a tasteful aspect. It puts all extracts from others to shame. The true diamond borrows not its lustre from false ones. The bride in fine linen needs none of the purple patches of a courtesan gaudily adorned." Ib. p. 320 seq.

Thus Herder; and in like strain has he said much more in his critical dissertation. The man that wrote the *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, a book unsurpassed as to the laying open of the nature and genius of the Hebrew language and poetry, was surely well qualified to form a judgment of the merits of the Apocalypse as to style and manner. If he is wanting in the profoundness and tact of a first rate philological interpreter, yet he possesses aesthetical power in no ordinary measure.

Herder's work checked the current of obliquy against the Apocalypse. Eichhorn's *Commentary*, published a few years afterwards, turned the current back the other way. I shall quote more sparingly from him, because his work is better known and more accessible among us, being written in Latin. In his prefatory Dissertation (p. 28) he says: "In adorning particular scenes and amplifying them with various and manifold ornament, one can scarcely express himself adequately as to the care, judgment, variety, abundance, and learning, which the author has exhibited." Speaking of the various agents introduced by the Apocalyptist, he says: "One cannot well entertain any doubt as to the fertile and almost inexhaustible genius of the poet in devising, adorning, polishing, and amplifying. In furnishing and adorning places and scenes he exhibits, indeed, and converts to his own use, the rich treasures gathered by the more ancient and the later Hebrew prophets and writers, and an ample apparatus of things invented, ideal conceptions, and imaginary views, which the genius of others had supplied; yet he

has not merely exhibited them, he has exhibited them well and skilfully, elegantly, strikingly, admirably, as became a poet endowed with large gifts of intellect and genius and with well-regulated judgment. Nor is even this all; he has changed, elaborated, adorned, amplified, altered, and dignified with much garnishing; so that the style, adorned with more art, moves on more ornate, elegant, and exquisite." Ib. p. 30 seq. Again, speaking of the writer's choice of diction, he says: "Nor is less of care and refined judgment to be found in the poet, with respect to choice of his words. The work, indeed, is prosaic as to form; yet by its commendable and wonderful simplicity, by its fictions or imaginary scenes, by its abundance of imagery and phantasms, and by appropriate things adapted to particular places or persons, or adjusted by special numbers, the book approaches near to the *poetic* form of writing. . . . With every kind of imagery, as with luminous spots, the writer has distinguished his work, so that in describing things he appears as novel, unusual, and splendid. . . . But what is most worthy of note is, that in the choice of words through the whole work he has employed such as are most exquisite, most elegant, in every respect most accurately defined and circumscribed; so that it is impossible to withhold one's praise for nicety of judgment and circumspection. . . . And since these things are so, how can one help wondering, that our poet stands so ill with many? Even his name excites disgust. He is accused of being one of those, whose minds are in a state of hallucination, and who are not far from mania. But surely one who acts the part of a poet not only with so much of genius and learning, but also of art, care, caution, and sound judgment, will appear to all candid and skilful judges of these matters, much more worthy of praise than of invidious and contemptuous appellations. But as art has no hater except the *ignoramus*, so a poet, who is so ingenious and learned and ornate, cannot have enemies and despisers, unless they be those who are far removed from all due perception of the ornate, the beautiful, the sublime, and the bold; or, being destitute of any judgment of their own, they merely follow others who have pronounced sentence against the work, although their own *praecordia* were never formed of the better clay." Ib. p. 40 seq.

It cannot be said now of either Herder or Eichhorn, that they were carried away by any superstitious regard for the mysterious, or that their judgment was warped by any special reverence for the Apocalypse as a sacred book. Herder indeed concedes *inspiration* to the writer; but he says somewhat more, probably, than he really means. So far as I can form an estimate of his real views, the difference between John's inspiration and that of the heathen poets amounted in his estimation to this, viz., that John treated of a subject pure and sacred in its nature, and which concerned the true God and the Christian church, while they chose sub-

jects of romance and fable as their theme, in connection with all the extravagances and superstitions of polytheism. In respect to this matter, however, Herder appears to have been variable in his feelings and views; but Eichhorn held out his opinions plainly and frankly to the view of the world, and treated the Apocalypse everywhere as the mere offspring of the poet's genius and fancy. There were few men in Germany, for the twenty-five years in which Eichhorn and Herder were in the zenith of sacred criticism and of influence, that would have called in question their *aesthetical* judgment; I think there are few anywhere, even now, that are entitled to call it in question. By general consent, the aesthetical merit of the Apocalypse is now placed on a lofty niche in the temple of genius, and those who deny it such a position, are in a fair way to be classed among that party which Eichhorn has described in the last sentence of the extract from him that is given above. The most laboured defence of the style and manner of the Apocalypse, may be found in Eichhorn's *Einleitung* to this book; where, however, he at the same time labours at length to support his view of its dramatical character. With all his errors in respect to this point, he has intermingled much that is true and striking with regard to the style of the Apocalypse.

We might appeal to other and older witnesses, also, whose voice, though heard long and widely in the Romish church, has as yet scarcely been listened to in the Protestant world. BOSSUET is a name which is never mentioned without commanding respect for learning, taste, and talent, among all competent judges. Bossuet has written a Commentary on the Apocalypse, full indeed of *Romanism*, but containing many a shrewd remark, and some fine openings in respect to the scope of the author. Let us listen for a moment to him, as speaking in his Preface: "Those who have any taste for piety find peculiar attraction in the admirable Revelation of Saint John. The name of Jesus Christ, with which John commences in the title, inspires one at the outset with holy joy. . . . Everything corresponds with this excellent title. Notwithstanding the profound depths of this divine book, one feels, in reading it, an impression so sweet and altogether so sublime, of the majesty of God; ideas so lofty of the mystery of Jesus Christ appear; a recognition of the people bought with his blood, is so lively; the pictures of his victories and of his dominion are so noble; the songs which celebrate the greatness of these are so wonderful; that there is enough to ravish all heaven and earth. . . . All the beauties of the Scriptures are concentrated in this book; all that is most touching, most vivid, most majestic, in the Law and in the Prophets, receives here a new splendour, and passes again before our eyes, that we may be filled with the consolations and the graces of all past ages. . . . In fact, here we find again, in this

apostle [John], the spirit of all the prophets, and of all the men commissioned by God. He has received the spirit of Moses, in order to sing the song of the new deliverance of the holy people, of a new ark, a new tabernacle, a new temple, and a new altar of incense. He has received the spirit of Isaiah and of Jeremiah, so as to describe the plagues of the new Babylon, and to astonish the universe with the noise of its fall. It is by the spirit of Daniel that he has disclosed to us the new beast, i. e. the new empire which is the enemy and persecutor of the saints, with its defeat and ruin. By the spirit of Ezekiel he has shown us all the riches of the new temple, where God will be worshipped, i. e. the riches of heaven and of the church. In fine, all the consolations, all the promises, all the grace, and all the light of the divine books, are united in this. All men inspired of God seem to have contributed for it all which they possess of the rich and the magnificent, in order to form the most beautiful picture of Jesus Christ which one can imagine; and we see nothing more clearly, than that he is truly the end of the law, the reality of its symbols, the body of its shadows, and the soul of its prophets."

"Nor must any one imagine, when Saint John brings forward all this, that he is a mere imitator of the prophets, his predecessors. All which he cites from them he elevates; he even leads us to discover the original itself of all the prophecies, which is none other than Jesus Christ and his church. Borne onward by the same spirit which animated the prophets, he has penetrated their mind, he has defined their meaning, he has revealed their mysteries, he has made the full glory of Jesus Christ to diffuse its entire radiance." Pref. p. 3 seq.

Bossuet, it will be perceived, has exhibited more of the Christian, and less perhaps of the rhetorician, than Herder or Eichhorn. It is well however to combine both, for the book before us unites them. How Luther could ever have rejected the Apocalypse, and thrust it from the canon, because, as he alleges, "it has no Christ in it," is more than we can well explain. The Romanist has, in respect to this matter, seen with much clearer vision than the Protestant.

§ 12. *Hermeneutical Principles necessary to the proper interpretation of the Apocalypse.*

There is one plain and obvious question, which every interpreter of the Apocalypse is bound to ask, viz. For what purpose was this book written? That is: Was it written to be read and understood by those to whom it was addressed; or was it intended for an enigma, which no Oedipus for centuries to come should be able to solve?

If the work were one of mere play of imagination or fancy; if the

writer designed merely to amuse his readers by the brilliancy of his poetical conceptions, or to puzzle them with the ingenuity of conundrums; if, in a word, his aim was merely to excite admiration, or wonder, or to make his contemporaries stare at him on account of his singularity or his mysticism, like Goethe in his *Faust;* then it would be of little avail to speak of *principles* of interpretation. *Interpretation*, in the sober and rational sense of the word, would be fairly out of question. More than this also we might well say; for we might truly affirm, that the book would not be worth the trouble of a serious effort to interpret it.

To my own mind, however, it seems to be quite plain, that no greater injustice could be done to any book, than to consider the Apocalypse in such a light. If there is any book in the New Testament that has the aspect of sincerity, of earnestness, and of deep feeling; of high spiritual sympathy for the welfare of the church; of glowing zeal for the interests of the kingdom of God; of unceasing and all pervading gratitude to Christ, for what he has done and suffered to save our sinful race; of heart-felt solicitude for the constancy and spiritual fidelity of Christians; of trembling concern for such as are tempted to apostatize; of confident hope as to the final triumph of truth and righteousness; and of unshaken faith in the glories of the upper world, which are consequent upon obtaining a mansion in the paradise of God—if there is any book that belongs to the New Dispensation, on whose very face all these things are enstamped in characters of light, the Apocalypse is that book. 'He that runneth may read' all this. And if this be true—denied it cannot well be—then here is no book of mere fancies, no tissue of enigmas, no mysticism designed only to amuse or perplex. No, not a real trace of all this. The writer was in downright and most sober earnest, if ever the world saw such a writer. On such subjects the sacred writers do not trifle. They are serious; gravely in earnest; full of feeling; carried away (it may be) with their subject, and rapt into the world of imagination, by a state of mind which is struggling for adequate expression and imagery, but which cannot find them so as to answer all its purposes in the world of realities, and is therefore sometimes forced beyond ordinary bounds in quest of them. Such is most palpably the character of him who wrote the Apocalypse. To read the book, and not to discover all this, not to see it diffused over every portion of it, would be nothing less than to traverse the whole ground with a bandage over one's eyes, or to survey it all through a dark or discoloured medium, which mars the beauty and vivid tints that are diffused over every prospect.

Must we not say, then, that an interpreter should begin his exegesis of the Apocalypse, with a deep and abiding conviction that he is en-

gaged in a serious business, and that all *jeaux d'esprit* arising from levity of mind, or disrespectful views of the contents of the book, are equally unbecoming and uncandid? The witticisms, or rather the meagre attempts at witticism, which may be met with in Oeder, Corrodi, and some others, disgust one not less by their want of good taste than by their irreverence. Suppose any one should take Milton's Paradise Lost in hand, and find some expression or image in it which does not agree with his own taste, and then should fall to jeering and scoffing at the book or the author; what should we say of him? And yet here, in the Apocalypse, is a higher theme than Milton's, if higher there can be; and here is a book which treats of it, by presenting a series of symbols such as never before were presented, in which God, and Christ, and good angels, and spirits of darkness, and all that is good and bad on earth, are actors, and are represented too as performing their respective parts in an appropriate manner—and shall an interpreter undertake to jeer and scoff? Such a picture needs only to be once looked at, in order to make a proper estimate of it.

But to return; the Apocalypse, we say, is a book that was written for a serious purpose, for an immediate effect (not excluding a remoter one), and for a highly important end. It was sent to the seven leading churches of Asia Minor. Did the writer wish and expect them to *understand* it? How can there be but one answer to this? He did expect to encourage, console, admonish, and instruct them, and all others likewise who in like circumstances should read it; and if so, he of course expected to be understood.

We might well ask, then, with Herder: 'Was there a *key* sent with the book, and has this been lost? Was it thrown into the sea of Patmos, or into the Maeander?' No; no key was sent, and none was lost. The primitive readers, I mean of course the men of intelligence among them, could understand the book; and were we for a short time in their places, we might dispense with all the commentaries upon it, and the theological romances which have grown out of it, that have made their appearance from the time of John's exile down to the present hour.

In their places, however, we cannot exactly put ourselves. Their language is not ours. Their circle of objects, their imagery, their modes of thinking, their culture, their circumstances, are and must be in some measure foreign to us. All that remains is, by the aid of helps which antiquity furnishes, to approximate as nearly to their situation as may be. The nearer we come, the more certain we are to understand the Apocalypse.

As I have already had occasion to say, there are but two ways in which any ancient writing, either sacred or profane, is now to be inter-

preted. The one is, by a use of the ordinary means of exegesis; the other, by supernatural aid, i. e. by inspiration. Who now lays claim to the latter? Some such there have been, and may be. But who allows the right to such a claim? Only enthusiasts and men that are misled. We come then to the simple principle, that *the Apocalypse, like all other books, must be interpreted by the aid of helps and principles like to those which are employed in the interpretation of other books.* Whatever there is in it which is intelligible, must be understood in this way; and (may we not add?) may be understood in this way.

To go into *minutiae* here, in respect to the interpretation of particular passages, would be entirely beyond my present aim. My object is merely to give a brief sketch of *radical* principles, from which we cannot depart without a certainty that we shall fall into error.

(1) It is now agreed, as has more than once been stated, that the Apocalypse is a book of *poetry*. Not that it is rhythm, or composed in heroic verse; but still it is essentially, in its very mode of conception, plan, and diction, a poetic work. Poetry is the characteristic of nearly all Hebrew prophecy; and why should not the Apocalypse, written by a Hebrew, be poetic? And if it be, all the rules and principles which apply to the figurative language, the allegory, the symbol, the peculiar diction of poetic prophecy, must be applied to the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

(2) In connection with this stands another highly important consideration. Oriental poetry and certainly the Hebrew, follows out the detail of symbol and allegory, for the sake of verisimilitude and in order to give vivacity to the representation, much beyond what we are accustomed to do in the western world. How much, now, of this detail is to be regarded as significant of sentiment, and as the exponent of instruction, is a matter that of necessity must always be left to judgment and taste. No exact technical rules can be laid down for the limitation of this matter. But the Apocalypse does not stand alone, in respect to its demands for such a principle of interpretation. In nearly all the parables of the Saviour, there is a necessity for the application of the same principle. Take, for example, the parable of the good Samaritan. What is the object? To inculcate the love of benevolence toward our fellow beings, whatever may be their relations to us, or however they may have been viewed by our prejudices. What now are the circumstances in the parable which answer the mere purpose of verisimilitude, and which we are not to thrust into the fore-ground of the picture, when the painter has placed them in the back-ground? They are such as these; the direction of the man who travels, viz., from Jerusalem toward Jericho; his falling among thieves and being robbed; the Samaritan's setting him on his own beast; his bringing him to an inn; his departure on

the morrow; his leaving two pence, etc. Not one of all these circumstances is essential to the gist of the parable, because each and all of these particulars might be, or not be, i. e. might be exchanged for others, and yet the traveller be presented as a poor sufferer and in need of friendly aid. The great *principle* inculcated would be the same, if any or all of the circumstances just mentioned had been omitted, or changed, and the story had consisted of a simple statement that might have been made, perhaps, by a single sentence. But then, the beauty, the vivacity, the verisimilitude, the impressiveness, of the whole parable—what would have become of these? They would have been sacrificed.

So is it in regard to many circumstances in other parables of Jesus; and so is it everywhere in respect to the symbols and allegories of the Hebrew prophets. So it must of course be in the Apocalypse, which treads so closely in their steps. Of all the qualifications needed by an interpreter of this book, none stands more conspicuous, none can be more needed, than the power of discriminating, with sound judgment and good taste, between what is essential and primary, and what is secondary and belongs merely to the congruity of the symbols. It is by mixing and confounding these, and by mistaking the one for the other, that nearly all the shipwrecks have been made, which have befallen many of those who have embarked on this ocean.

It were easy to illustrate this by examples, but where should I begin, or where end? I may, however, specificate one or two cases, in order to make the subject plain. In chap. vi. is a picture of a dread array, marshalled against the enemies and persecutors of the church. The latter are to be assailed with war and famine and pestilence, or at least by the agents of destruction; and their fall is certain. All this is shown by successive symbols. A conqueror on a white horse, the symbol of victory, leads the van. Then follows a red horse, the symbol of blood, and his rider brandishes a drawn sword. Next comes a black horse, the emblem of mourning and distress, and his rider is furnished with balances, which are nicely to adjust by weight the necessaries of life; this indicates famine or scarcity of food. The rear is brought up by the king of terrors, accompanied by ghosts from the world beneath. All this is plainly *one* army, gathered for one purpose, and furnished for the exercise of awful power. Blood, famine, and pestilence, i. e. the means of destruction, are to waste the enemy. *When* or *by whom*, is not the question here. A particular answer to these questions would be detail, which would mar the outline-picture. It is one and a simple picture, merely composed of parts which have a unity of design; and one cannot view it simply in this light, without an involuntary awe. Yet what have some, and even most, interpreters done? They have assigned to the leader and conqueror one place and to his army another;

they have imagined different countries, and even remote and separate ages, as the *where* and the *when* of these prophetic symbols. Famine prevails in one country, pestilence in another, the wild beasts in another, and war in another; and all this, without any particular relation, or indeed any relation at all, to the *speedy* destruction of the enemy who are before the eye of the seer. Can anything be more incongruous, more palpably mistaken, more clearly in bad taste, more repugnant to the true nature of the symbols employed? If *a priori* conceptions of what John *ought* to reveal, had not taken the lead in such interpretations, they never could have been devised.

Let us take another example from Rev. xiv. To any one who has attentively studied and analyzed the contents of the Apocalypse, it must be evident that chap. xiv. is *episode*. All which is intended by the symbols there exhibited, is merely to indicate the *certainty* of victory over the beast, the false prophet, and Satan their instigator or leader. Hence the scene opens with exhibiting the Lamb, at the head of the 144,000 who had been sealed in their foreheads, and redeemed from fierce and cruel persecutions—which redemption was a sure pledge of power to save, and of faithfulness in performing promises. How dear all faithful confessors are to the great Head of the church, is next shown in few but very expressive words. Other symbols in the sequel, further confirm what is intimated by this leading scene. An angel, flying through mid-air, proclaims the universal spread of the gospel. Another angel proclaims the fall of great Babylon. A third declares the dreadful end of all who partake in her idolatry. A voice from heaven responds, and declares the blessedness of all who shall be faithful martyrs to the truth. What has thus been done, first by symbol and then by proclamation, is, after the manner of the book, done as it were a *third* time by the employment of new and different symbols. The earth is represented as a great harvest-field speedily to be reaped, and then as being reaped; and finally, as presenting a vast vintage, the clusters of which are cut off with the pruning-knife and gathered together. These are cast into a wine-press, and a dark fluid, the symbol of blood, flows out to a great distance.

Who now that attentively considers all this, does not perceive that there is an entire *unity* of design in the whole chapter? And this design is neither more nor less than to give assurance, that the beast and all his coadjutors are about to be destroyed. Well may the writer exclaim, as he does: "Here is the *patience* of the saints!" That is, here is abundant reason for the saints to be patient and submissive, for trials and persecutions must abound; but here is encouragement for them, also, inasmuch as these trials will come to a speedy end. The downfall of the persecuting power and of all its allies, is absolutely certain.

What shall we say, now, to those interpreters, who seek for *historical events* and *facts*, in remote ages, which are to be the fulfilment of these so-called predictions? What defence can be made for converting *episode* into the main body of the work—for converting mere symbols of strong assurance that the beast will be overcome, into representations of actual battles, into pictures of veritable historical events? No adequate defence can be made for this proceeding, either at the bar of reason or of taste. Nothing short of overlooking the true structure of the book and the mutual relation of its parts, can lead an interpreter to such an exegesis as this. Yet how often has this been done!

Is it not just and proper, then, to insist that an interpreter of the Apocalypse should have a due regard to the nature of symbols, and learn, if possible, how much of them belongs to the fore-ground, and how much to the back-ground, of the picture? The principle is too plain to be called in question, and too important to be neglected.

(3) Scarcely if at all inferior in point of importance to either of the preceding hermeneutical principles, as they respect the Apocalypse, is the plain and obvious principle, that GENERIC, *and not specific and individual, representations are to be sought for in the book before us.*

No one principle of interpretation has been so often and so palpably violated in the exegesis of the Apocalypse, as this. In all cases of the like nature in the Old Testament, we find only *generic* pictures, (if I may be allowed the expression), and not minute drawings of individualities. If the reader doubts this for a moment, let him turn back and reperuse § 2. above, where a synoptical view of the Messianic prophecies is given. Almost the only exception in all these, to the principle of generic representation, is the single case where the sufferings and death of Christ are depicted, as in Ps. xxii. and Is. liii. Why now should the whole character of predictions, respecting the Christian church, be entirely changed in the New Testament; and in cases, too, where the subject and object are the very same as in the Old? How can it be imagined that John, who follows everywhere so closely in the steps of the Hebrew prophets, should so entirely depart from them in regard to this particular? There must be some good reason in order to render this credible; and such a reason has not yet been proffered. It is the great and leading concerns of the church, and those only, which are sketched in the Apocalypse. How could the writer, in the compass of so few pages, undertake to detail all the minute events of future ages, both those which belong to the church, and also to civil communities? It was impossible.

If it be said, that still he may have sketched out some of the most striking and prominent events with some good degree of individuality; where in the Apocalypse, I would ask, are such sketches to be found?

Characteristics he does indeed draw, occasionally, which may be individually applied; e. g. of the beast, and of the false prophet. But when he comes to symbolize the downfall of these, all is in the most *general* way; as any one may see, who will read the 16th and 19th chapters of the Revelation.

But a multitude of expositors are not content with finding even minute *ecclesiastical* matters in the Apocalypse. They must needs find profane as well as sacred history. The Goths, the Vandals, the Huns, petty kingdoms and states of remote ages, battles fought centuries after John was dead; local famine even, and pestilence, earthquakes, droughts, volcanos, tornados, and other evils, at divers times and places; are all to be found in the pages of the Revelation. In short, the work is converted into a syllabus of civil and natural history.

How now can a man of sober discretion, who has ever studied Hebrew prophecy, give ear to all this? An expositor finds in Rev. vi, for example, the description of a certain war, of a particular famine, or of a pestilence, all of which took place centuries after the book was written. On what ground does he defend this view? On the ground that there are things in the apocalyptic picture, which, in his opinion, tally well with the subsequent events in question. Let it be so; we will concede that there are things which might tally, if the author's design and the context would permit us to make such an application. But if these do *not* permit it, what shall we then say to interpretation so conducted? The misfortune in this case is, that what applies to this particular battle, or that famine, or pestilence, would apply equally well to every battle that has been fought, and every famine and pestilence that have laid waste, from the days of John down to the present hour. Who then can choose between all these conflicting claims? If the author has assigned neither *time* nor *place*, who can fix on these for him? If he has, then he alone is to be consulted, in order to know what battle, or famine, or pestilence, he has alluded to. The context is the only arbiter, most evidently, which can settle such questions. My belief is, that in a general way the writer of the Apocalypse has settled them. And this is enough. It is all that would be safe and profitable to the church; it is all that is needed for spiritual instruction and consolation.

I say for *spiritual* instruction; and in so saying I mean to be understood as designing to imply, that any other kind of instruction would be inapposite to the occasion of writing such a book, and also to the design of the author. *Civil history!* And is the Apocalypse, then, a book for the consultation of politicians, in regard to their schemes, and the probable success of them? Does it tell them what kingdom will triumph, and what will fall, in the contest of arms? Is it a book written for such a purpose as the heathen oracles were uttered? Are men to resort to it,

in order to gratify their prurient curiosity about future events of a mere worldly nature? No; this is all a dream. John was no chronicler of civil events. He was no soothsayer, like those of Delos and of Delphos. Such things, and such only, as relate to the *spiritual* welfare and prosperity of the church, are the objects of his prophetic vision. Whoever finds mere civil history here, must make it from his own fancy and imagination; he cannot deduce it from the text of John in a truly philological manner.

Almost everything depends, in many parts of the Apocalypse, on the observance of the canon of interpretation which we are now discussing. Yet there seem to be some minds, that are incapable of duly appreciating this canon. If one should tell them, that after all which is symbolized in Rev. vi. respecting war, famine, and pestilence, (supposing the persecuting Jews are the object of the prediction), it would be unnecessary to look for these events in a *literal* way, in order to find a fulfilment of the prophecy, they would exclaim with strong emotion: 'What! Is there no *reality*, then, to be looked for as associated with these predictions in the way of fulfilment? Is not John converted into a mere *fortune-teller* by such a process as is here proposed?' Should one still add, in the way of defending the general ground on which he stands in the interpretation of prophetic symbols, that the *overthrow* and *downfall* of the persecuting enemy is the *substance* of the prediction before us; that the *way* and *manner* in which this is accomplished cannot be of much importance to the church, so long as the event itself is certain; that the symbols of war, and famine, and pestilence, are here employed, merely because they are the usual instruments in destroying the power of hostile nations; that it is altogether natural and proper to employ them in order to make a lively representation of the subject in hand; and that if some other power than the Roman had overrun and subjugated Palestine, and put a complete stop to the persecutions there carried on, chap. vi. of the Apocalypse would have been as truly fulfilled as it has now been; that if even other means than war and famine and pestilence had accomplished the same ends, there would have been a *virtual* fulfilment of the predictions; and of course, that the generic idea of humbling, and subduing, and disarming, and punishing the persecuting enemy, is all that can be important to the church in the predictions before us—I say, if all this were to be alleged in answer to him who seeks for and confidently expects minute, specific, and individual events in prophecy, I see not what answer he could give; although it may be doubted whether all this would bring conviction with it to his mind, specially in case he had already pledged himself to a particular and favorite interpretation of a very different tenor. I do not indeed, for myself, regard the symbols of the Apocalypse in quite so abstract a light as this; but if events had

shown them to be so, I should not feel the least difficulty with regard to the real and substantial fulfilment of the prediction before us.

In my apprehension, it is from an abuse of the principle in question, that most of the flagrant errors committed in the interpretation of the Apocalypse have arisen, in modern times. The imagery and the symbols of this book are mostly of such a generic nature, that there is no difficulty in making them apply, if one is determined so to do, to almost any leading events that have affected the church, either in more remote ages or in more recent times. The characteristics for example of the beast, although, when compared throughout and viewed collectively, they cannot with any good degree of philological probability be applied to any other than the *heathen, Roman*, persecuting power, will no doubt apply, at least many of them, to the like *ecclesiastical* power in later ages. The Protestant interpreter lays hold of this circumstance, and with great zeal, and it may be with much sincerity and honesty of purpose, applies it to the Pope and his persecuting allies and coadjutors. How far the circumstance, that the description of the beast answers in many particulars to him and his allies, and that some important advantages in argument may accrue to the Protestant in consequence of making such an application, may go in persuading him that this is a correct mode of exegesis, and inducing him to adopt and urge it, is forcibly illustrated by the case of Luther. This Reformer, when he published his German translation of the New Testament, thrust the Apocalypse from the canon, and printed it merely in the way of an *Appendix*, and as an apocryphal book. His main reasons were, that the book was unintelligible, and that there was "no Christ in it." Subsequent critics, more keen-sighted in exegesis than Luther, found, or thought that they had found, good reason for applying John's description of the beast to the Pope and his adherents. As the contest waxed warmer, Luther perceived the advantage of such an ally; and it was not long before consent was given to a reception of the Apocalypse. Thus the book was restored to its place of honour at the close of the canon, and John was converted into one of the most formidable assailants of the Romish camp.

What now was done, on the other hand, by the opponents of Luther and the Reformation? They speedily found the *beast* in Luther, and the *false prophet* in Calvin. They also discovered, that even the name of the beast, as indicated by the number 666, was to be found in Luther's original proper name. Arguments, such as they were, were not lacking on the part of the Romanists. Feuardentius has given us a specimen of them, in his note upon the famous passage in Irenaeus (V. 30) respecting the name of the beast.

Who now has the better in such a contest? The Romanists have ar-

rayed great learning on their side, as well as the Protestants. Which of them shall we trust? My *feelings* would certainly lead me to side with the Protestants; and I doubt not that they have the better side in the argument; if indeed either side can be said to have the better, when neither is in the right. In truth, the Romanists have so little of even the show of argument in this case, that one can scarcely bring himself to believe that they are in earnest. Neither Calvin nor Luther had dominion over the *city of seven hills*, nor were they engaged in promoting idol-worship. How could they then be the *beast* and the *false prophet?* But, on the other hand, nothing is more certain in all the Apocalypse, than that a *heathenish idolatrous* power is described in Rev. xiii. seq., a power that was *then* persecuting the church. If this point be not clear, then must we absolutely despair of making anything clear, by exegesis, out of the book before us.

I should have more to say on this subject, if this were the appropriate place. As it is not, I must content myself with merely observing, that the view which I have taken of the Apocalypse in the preceding pages, is one which will make a part of this book applicable in one sense to papal Rome, or to any other power, which may lay violent hands upon Christians, and contend against the progress of the gospel. What was done on the part of heaven, at the time of John and speedily after, in order to defend the truth and promote the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, is the model of what will be done in all succeeding ages for the like purpose. So far as the Pope and his adherents imitate the original beast and false prophet, or so far as Protestants do what injures the church, so far they come under sentence and condemnation like to that which was pronounced upon the beast. The *analogy* of God's dealings with his true church renders it certain, that hindrances thrown in the way of it, whatever they may be, will be removed. If excision of enemies becomes necessary, it will take place. The doom of all that opposes itself to the progress of true religion, is sealed by the Apocalypse. So far Protestants are plainly in the right. All that is wanting, then, to show that the downfall of Romanism is virtually foretold by John, is to show that Romanism resembles the beast and the false prophet. But when I say, that its downfall is virtually predicted in the Apocalypse, I must not be understood as affirming, that John himself had the papal hierarchy definitely in view, when he wrote this book. I do not see any way in which this can be rendered exegetically probable. John wrote to console and admonish and encourage the churches, then bleeding at every pore under the glittering weapons of a blood-thirsty tyrant. And what does he do in order to accomplish his purpose? He assures the churches that this dreadful contest is not always to continue. Ere long victory will perch on the banners of the cross. The church

will not become extinct by all which tyrants can do, but will rise from its ruinous state, will expand, will fill the world with its triumphs, and prostrate in the dust all who lift up a hand against it. To crown all, he looks with a prophetic eye through the vista of distant ages, and sees that the setting sun of the church militant, and the old age of the world in which it dwells, will be glorious; and finally, that the new Jerusalem will be her abode through ages that have no end. Short indeed, and mere outlines, are the descriptions of all that belongs to the *distant* future. But they serve to finish the picture which John had begun, and thus to complete the measure of consolation and encouragement which he designed to administer.

How can we, then, when such a design and such a method of accomplishing it stand out with marked prominence in this picture—how can we attribute to John a mere syllabus of the civil and ecclesiastical history of remote ages, a history of civil commotions and tumults, or the mere description of literal famines and pestilences, of earthquakes and of tempests? In the name of all that is pertinent and congruous in prophecy, I ask, what have these to do with the object which John had before him? Or are we, as some have slily hinted, to regard him as in a state of hallucination when he wrote the Apocalypse? Or if any one alleges that some notice of the *great apostasy* in the church was surely to be expected, then may I ask again: In what way could it either *console* or *encourage* John's readers, to be told that at some future day a great part of the church would become heretical, or act the part of apostates, and persecute and destroy true Christians as badly as the heathen were then doing? And is this *consolatory* to poor fainting spirits, filled with dread lest the light of divine truth might be quenched in the blood of its friends, and anxious for one ray of hope that the church would yet rise and triumph over all its enemies? It would in fact seem not unlike some degree of hallucination, to engage in making such disclosures, with the expectation of reviving the drooping spirits of suffering Christians by them. It is out of reasonable question, then, that we should take, and be able to support, such a view of this subject as the popular exegesis demands. In truth, it requires us virtually to set aside the idea, that John had in view any present, important, and appropriate object in the writing of his book; or if he had such an object in view as appears to lie upon the face of that book, then, according to the exegesis which we are controverting, he took the strangest course imaginable in order to accomplish it, i. e. he wrote a syllabus of the civil and ecclesiastical history of distant ages, the highest end of which, in respect to those whom he addressed, could be only to gratify their prurient historical curiosity.

Such a view of the book will not bear a sober examination. It is too

improbable, incongruous, and inapposite to the necessities of the times. A church bleeding at every pore, and ready to faint or to apostatize —such a church addressed by a grave writer who has a superintendence over its concerns—and merely or principally told what things will happen in distant future ages, things civil, ecclesiastical, and even appertaining to the natural world, most of which were to be developed a thousand years or more after all the members of that church were dead! Nothing short of the most express testimony of John himself, that he meant to address them in such a strain, ought to satisfy us that he has done it.

What other book in all the Bible do we allow to be treated in this way by interpreters? Do we not insist, that they shall inquire with great diligence and accurately investigate, what the special and appropriate object of each writer was? And in respect to each separate part of any book, not dependent on the rest, if such there be, is not the same inquiry to be urged with all possible earnestness and diligence? It is even so. How can it be accounted for, then, that when we come to the Apocalypse, every process of this nature should be dispensed with, and we should betake ourselves to guessing on which of its many sides a certain die must fall? What has become, all at once, of *the scope*, *the circumstances*, *the immediate object*, *the exigencies*, of the writer of this book? Were there no such things? Or is the book a mere *jeu d'esprit*, an effort to amuse, a romance full of enigmas designed to puzzle the reader? Away with all such surmises! And away, too, I must in sober earnest say, with all the expositions that are built upon them! It is a degradation of a divine book to treat it in such a manner. And when we are called on to accede to any exposition of this book, which is altogether reckless of the occasion, the object, and the immediate design of the writer, we are not permitted, by any proper regard to the laws of hermeneutics, to listen to such an exposition. Why should we set ourselves afloat upon a boundless ocean of conjecture and fancy, without rudder or compass? The demand to do so is unreasonable. We are not bound in any sense, philological, exegetical, theological, or reasonable, to listen to requisitions of this nature, much less to be guided by them.

(4) There are some other subordinate considerations, which have a bearing on the interpretation of the Apocalypse, that deserve a distinct notice.

(*a*) The book, as we have seen, is a species of the Epopee—different, in this respect, from any other prophetic book in the whole Scriptures, and resembling in part, i. e. as to the method of its structure, the book of Job, the Epopee of the Old Testament. We must, therefore, make all the allowances which are due to such a method of composition.

Why should we not do here, what we do in all other cases? An Epopee may have, not to say *must* have, its episodes; and if so, then we may allow them to exist here, in case the composition indicates, (as I cannot doubt it does), that they should be allowed. There is nothing strained or artificial, in resorting to an exegesis founded on such a supposition or assumption. Have not the Iliad, the Aeneid, the Paradise Lost, and other poems of the like nature, their *episodes?* And moreover, are not all critics ready to allow them? Why then should it be thought strange, that an interpreter of the Apocalypse should claim the like concession for this book?

(*b*) There is another circumstance of a kindred nature, which deserves notice in this connection. It is a fact, that although by far the greatest portions of the Apocalypse are of a prophetic nature, and therefore have principal reference to the future, yet some of it must be regarded as *regressive*, i. e. as bringing before the mind what is already *past*. Omitting smaller and mere circumstantial passages of this nature, I would refer particularly to chap. xii, the whole of which, as appears to me, must be looked upon in the light now stated. The writer is here passing to a new theme—his second great catastrophe. In the arrangement of his first catastrophe, he has presented us with a magnificent proem—the theophany and the vision of the sealed book. To repeat that theme again, at the commencement of his second catastrophe, would not be a display of that sagacity which he has elsewhere so abundantly manifested. He resorts, therefore, to a new subject. He is about to introduce a combination of immeasurably the most powerful enemies of the church that had yet appeared, who are very much embittered against it. His proem casts light on the origin of their state of mind, and on the source of the peculiar and malicious activity which was in operation against Christianity. Satan, the great enemy of all good, who had ruined the first Adam, had done his utmost to accomplish the destruction of the second. A jealous and cruel king is excited by him to destroy all the children at Bethlehem, in order to cut off the infant Saviour. The Apocalyptist, however, expressly notices only the agency of Satan. The mother of the infant child flees to the wilderness, and finds there a place of refuge. What is this but the flight of Mary with her newly born child, before the massacre by Herod? When this child is "caught up to God," Satan and his coadjutors follow him in their rage, and assay to enter the upper regions in the pursuit. But Michael and his angels come forth to battle against them, and they are defeated and cast down to the earth. Stung with rage and disappointment, Satan, finding all efforts of this nature to be unavailing, falls to persecuting the church with unrelenting fury. In this state of things commences the combined action of Satan, the beast, and the false prophet; which

also is in part *regressive*, but mostly has respect either to the *present*, or is *prospective*, i. e. it pertains to the then future.

In this way the writer of the Apocalypse has, with no little tact and skill, introduced the actors in the second great catastrophe. Specific names of persons or nations he does not give, at first; but in the progress of the work, an episode (chap. xvii.) is devoted to the purposes of disclosure. The whole representation taken together could hardly fail to leave a correct impression on the mind of Christian readers then living, as to the class of persecutors whom the writer meant to designate.

In circumstances like these, and for purposes such as have been named, what objection, on the score of propriety and relevancy, can be made against a proem, such as chap. xii, which is *regressive?* Is it not the fact, that in nearly all the prophecies of the Old Testament, which are of any considerable length, there is more or less of allusion to the *past*, and recounting of it? Surely this cannot be denied. Why then should we refuse to John a liberty that we concede to other prophets? And above all, why should we deny him such a liberty, when his work is far more extended and complicated, and more nicely arranged by the rules of art, than any other single prophetic composition in all the Bible? Reasonable criticism cannot well withhold its consent to such an arrangement.

(*c*) The circumstance, that the last part of the book briefly adverts to the *very distant future*, cannot be brought as an objection against the views above exhibited, respecting the more immediate object of the Apocalypse, and the urgent necessities of the times which called it into being.

The critical reader of the Old Testament prophecies cannot fail to call to mind, that a great number of them close with *Messianic* views, that is, with prospects of the then distant future. This is, one might almost say, the habitual order of Isaiah's prophecies; and not unfrequently it is to be found elsewhere. But when John wrote, the Messianic age had begun. His *distant future* must therefore be of another kind. It is not then the commencement, but the *close*, of the Messianic period, which he has developed in the concluding part of his work. In so doing, it will be perceived that he has only followed the like path with the prophets who had preceded him. To them the opening of the Messianic period, and specially its full bloom in the Millennium, was the highest part of the climax which the mind could then well reach. Such a future condition of things, was an almost indescribable advance beyond the state of things then present. With John, as with the older prophets, the millennial state still belongs to the distant future, and is arranged accordingly; but the final rest of the people of God from all the assaults of enemies, and the consummation of their happiness in the

world of light and love, are advances beyond preceding prophets. Mere hints concerning this are all that can be found in those early writers; but in the work of John a development is made, which, though brief because it belongs to the distant future, is still like a picture which to the eye of a beholder stands out, as it were, from the canvass.

But the reader would greatly mistake the matter, if he should suppose for a moment, that all this is so arranged in order merely to follow the example of the ancient prophets. The fact plainly is, that scarcely anything in the Apocalypse, indeed we may say, nothing produces so much excitement on a true-hearted reader, as the brief sketch which the writer has made of the distant future. It was to the poor, suffering, and bleeding martyr, like the sun rising in all his splendor upon a region of tempest and of darkness; or like the same sun arising upon a benighted mariner, who has been tossed upon the mountain-wave and driven by fierce winds until the roar of breakers begins to be heard. The Apocalypse places the harbour in full view, on which no storms of sorrow or persecution ever beat.

Such are the general views which should be taken by an interpreter of the Apocalypse, who expects to follow on in the path which its author trod. He must go back, and think and feel and sympathize with the author of the book and the Christians of his day. He must allow him all the latitude, which poetry, symbol—long-continued symbol, protracted beyond previous example—epopee, numerosity in the relative parts of the book, and moreover the different circumstances in which the author wrote, can justly claim. More than this he need not do; in order to make the book appear intelligible and consistent. Less than this would be apt to mislead the critic, and to present the book as full of incongruities, or at least of unintelligible representations.

(*d*) The TIMES which are so frequently designated in chap. xi—xiii. of the Apocalypse, might constitute a fruitful theme of disquisition, among the topics which are important to be understood by an interpreter. I shall here premise, however, only some general considerations; reserving a particular discussion of them for an *Excursus* on passages where the designations of them occur.

It so happens, that the apparently mysterious designations of time, in the passage to which reference has just been made, all occur, either literally or virtually, in the book of Daniel. Thus the forty and two months, Rev. 11: 2. 13: 5; the 1260 days, Rev. 11: 3 and 12: 6; the time, times, and half a time, Rev. 12: 14—all of them = $3\frac{1}{2}$ years or 1260 days—occur in the form of *time, times, and a half* or *dividing of time*, in Dan. 7: 25 and 12: 7. Must the interpreter regard these designations, in the book before us, as *literal* or as *symbolical*?

Most interpreters in Germany, of late, have leaned to the symbolical

side; as did Vitringa, in a more remote period. Lücke, in his Introduction to the Apocalypse (§ 59), appealing to Matt. 24: 36 and Acts 1: 7, which declare that 'the Father alone has the knowledge of times and seasons in his power;' appealing also to the consideration, that no fixed chronological dates are anywhere aimed at in the Apocalypse, from which we can make out a reckoning of times with any accuracy; then goes on to say: "These considerations decide fully in favour of the hermeneutical position, that *chronology* in the Apocalypse, in accordance with the design of the writer, acts only a very subordinate part, and that the numbers in general must be regarded, and interpreted, merely as prophetic symbols of general relations of time that cannot be computed with any exactness." p. 572. In like manner Ewald, Steudel, Bleek, De Wette, and many others have decided, in regard to this matter.

On the other hand, since the days of Joseph Mede, most commentators in the English world have made each of the 1260 days to stand for *years*, and striven to show *when* the period in each case commences, and of course *when* it terminates.

This last opinion I have elsewhere examined,* and shall not go into any discussion of it here. The leading considerations respecting it, I would hope to present in an Excursus on the passages in Revelation which are referred to above. I will only say, that of all the opinions ever thrust upon the hermeneutics of prophecy, I know of none more ungrounded or untenable than this.

In a different way, and more respectfully, I feel obliged to speak respecting the opinion of Lücke and others, in regard to the *symbolical* designation or use of numbers in the Apocalypse. Such a use is made, times almost without number, of *seven*, and *three*, and in some measure of *ten*, and *forty*, and *one thousand*, in the Old Testament, and partly in the New. But such a use cannot be called common or frequent, in regard to any numbers excepting three, seven, and one thousand. We have seen above, what part *three* and *seven* act in the form and structure of the relative parts of the Apocalypse, and in a multitude of its subordinate groupings.

But in the case before us, none of these numbers are concerned. There is no *usus loquendi*, therefore, in favour of the position taken by Lücke, unless indeed he can make out something like this from Dan. 7: 25 and 12: 7. My conviction however is, that this cannot well be done. *The time, times, and half a time*, in Daniel, manifestly apply in a *literal* sense to the period in which Antiochus Epiphanes persecuted the Jews, interrupted the temple-service, and profaned the sanctuary. Moreover, the limitation of time is historically true and correct. If then a sym-

* In my little work entitled *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy.*

bolic use only is made by John of the period just named, it is peculiar to himself, and not in the way of analogy. The passages respecting the three and a half years of drought in the days of Elijah (James 5: 17. Luke 4: 25), look somewhat as if this period had become a kind of proverbial or symbolical one; and probably such a usage in speech may have been occasioned by Dan. 7: 25. 12: 7. But in the cases before us in the Apocalypse, it is my belief that a just exposition of the passages that are concerned with the designations of time, in this book, and a proper investigation of ancient history, will show that the writer need not be understood in any other way than in the usual and literal one. If the events predicted in connection with these periods of time actually took place, (minute accuracy of *days* in such a case is not to be expected or demanded), then what good objection can be made against the literal exegesis of the designations in question? None; at least this seems to be plain; for what rule is more certain in hermeneutics, than that every passage is to be *literally* interpreted, unless there is some good and cogent reason why it cannot be? If a literal interpretation should make a sense frigid, inept, impossible, or highly improbable, then it must be abandoned. But in the case before us, no one can contend that any of these senses would be deduced from the text by a literal interpretation. Consequently we are bound to follow it. And we are the more specially bound to do so, because *numbers* employed in the designations of *time* cannot, in any cases of usual occurrence, be regarded as tropical, or as being employed only in the way of symbol.

In regard to a few of the cases where time is designated in the Apocalypse, it seems plain that the mere literal signification is not to be rigidly insisted on. For example; the church in Smyrna are told, that they shall have tribulation *ten days*, Rev. 2: 10; where merely a very short period is doubtless meant. The locusts that come up from the bottomless pit are to torment men *five months*, Rev. 9: 5; where the usual period in which the natural locusts develope themselves is designated, while the figurative sense of the whole passage is not limited in this way, i. e. the figurative locusts are not restrained within that exact period of development, but the writer merely signifies, that they, like the natural locusts, are to have their full and appropriate development. The *three and a half days*, in which the two witnesses lie dead in the streets of the great city, Rev. 11: 11, seem to receive their limitation from the three and a half years so frequently employed in chap. xi—xiii. It of course designates but a very short period, one within which the corpses of the slain would not putrefy and dissolve. An exact and literal designation of time can hardly be supposed to be an object with the writer, in such cases as these.

The *thousand years* in chap. xx. is a case that might admit of some

question. The frequent use of a *thousand* years for a period of time long and in its nature indefinite, is so frequent in the Scriptures, that one might easily rest satisfied with such a use in the case before us; for there would be good exegetical ground from general analogy. In fact, little can be reasonably said against such an interpretation. After all, however, there is room to doubt whether the writer does not mean here, as in chap. xi—xiii, to be literally interpreted in regard to the designation of time. My belief is, that the analogy of the book itself rather demands a literal interpretation in this case; but I do not think the argument from analogy is here a very forcible one. The instance of the *thousand years* in Rev. xx, is in many respects not like the cases respecting *time* in Rev. xi—xiii. And even in regard to these latter cases, it is scarcely necessary to add, that no one, who is well versed in the interpretation of prophetic periods in general, and is especially conversant with the uses of the numbers *three* and *seven* in the Scriptures, would think of being confined to the exactness of a day, or a week, or even a month, in the designation of such periods as three and a half years. This is half of the number seven; and, as in all cases in which such numbers are employed to designate time, from the very nature of the thing nice regard to fractions of time cannot be reasonably expected.

This may suffice at present for the topic now before us. There is some good reason, moreover, as I may with propriety suggest, for being explicit and somewhat definite here. Every one who is conversant with the history of apocalyptic interpretation for these last two centuries, must well know what boundless conjectures have been indulged about the times designated in the Apocalypse, and what airy speculations and phantasies have been built upon them. It is time that they were brought to an end.

(5) I close this view of the exegetical principles by which we must be guided in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, by some general suggestions, which are not indeed of a novel nature (for they are implied in what has been said), but still are important and easily understood, although they require experience and skill in order that a right application of them should be made. These suggestions are, that while all allow the Apocalypse to be a *book of symbols* throughout, few have preserved a happy medium in explaining them. There is a Scylla and a Charybdis here. If, on the one hand, we resolve all into the mere elements of Jewish civil history, and the primary triumphs of Christianity over *Jewish* unbelief and obstinacy, as many have done; if we can find (with Eichhorn and Herder) the two witnesses in the two Jewish high priests, and (with Züllig) the seven hills and seven kings (of Rev. xvii.) in Jerusalem; then we must make our way by mere

force through many of the most important parts of the book, and never can be satisfied that we have obeyed the dictates of hermeneutics. And so with the scheme of interpretation which makes everything, or nearly everything, in the book refer merely to the destruction of the *heathen*. These two schemes are different and opposite methods of the like fundamental error. Another and not less important error, however, is, to *generalize* everything in the book to such an extent, that nothing of the *concrete* remains. The wars, the battles, the famines, etc., are not only abstract, but the parties or agents concerned with them are also abstractions; and so, all vanishes away at last into thin air; or if it be an object of vision at all, it is one which is seen only through a misty atmosphere, and with great indistinctness. "In medio tutissimus." ALL SYMBOL MUST HAVE SOMETHING REAL FOR ITS BASIS. There must be historic facts, and historic existences, concerned with such a series of symbols as are here found. But individual and specific events, or *details* of invasions, battles, famine, pestilence, and the like, we should not look for, because it is not to the writer's purpose to give them; and above all it is not to his purpose, to write the civil or natural history of remote ages. The wants and woes of the times are a good and important guide to the interpreter, in these cases of danger. Let him beware, and not make the book a mere declamatory *hariolation* on the one hand, nor, on the other, injure it by giving it a definiteness in respect to minute historical significancy, which would destroy all reasonable ground of its having been useful to the church in primitive times, and mar all prospect of its religious usefulness in after ages.

§ 13. *Original Readers of the Apocalypse, and their circumstances.*

When Paul inscribes his Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, etc., no sober critic thinks of calling in question, whether the respective churches which he addresses had a real existence, nor whether Paul meant that what he said in these cases should be *historically* interpreted. It would be deemed quite a superfluous labour, to undertake the formal task of vindicating such an interpretation.

Why should not the same principles be applied to the Apocalypse, which is introduced by epistles addressed to seven different churches, and which purports to treat of matters deeply interesting to those churches? It is agreed on all hands, that when the Apocalypse was written, there were Christian churches at Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. It is conceded that John, (whether apostle or presbyter), who names himself as the author of the book, lived at or near Ephesus about this period. Whoever he

was, he must have been a man of conspicuous character and great influence. Such a book, if we have made a right estimate of it in the preceding pages, never came from any ordinary hand or common-place writer. At the beginning and the end of his work, he earnestly commends it to the most solemn and diligent attention of the churches whom he addresses, and guards carefully against any interpolations or abscissions of it. All this looks like reality, and has at least the appearance of much earnestness, and of deep interest in the welfare of the churches.

Would any simple-minded and unsophisticated reader ever think of putting all this to the account of mere symbol, or of profound mysticism? Never, as it seems to me, would such a thought enter his mind. It is only after the body of the work has been read, and many symbolic and dark and difficult passages have been found there, that any reader begins to devise some mystic exegesis for the prologue and epilogue of this book.

I shall merely glance at some of the efforts that have been made, to put a mystical interpretation on the proem in question. It has become unnecessary, at last, to canvass at any great length the extravagant positions that have been taken and defended with not a little zeal, in days that are past.

The earliest commentator on the Apocalypse, whose work is extant, is Victorinus, bishop of Petavio,* who deceased about A. D. 303, and who therefore was a contemporary of Irenaeus. His work written in Latin, although doubtless interpolated and changed here and there, still preserves, as is more generally conceded, the great outlines of thought, which it originally exhibited. On p. 415, Victorinus says: "What John addresses to one church, he addresses to all. Paul has first taught us, that there are seven churches in the whole world, and that the seven churches named mean the church catholic. That John might observe the same method, he has not exceeded the number of seven churches." What Victorinus means in respect to Paul, is, that by writing to *seven* churches, and only to seven, he has taught us that all the churches are comprehended in this number; and hence he deduces the principle, that John, when he names seven churches, means, in the same way as Paul, to comprise all the churches in the world.

In this view of the number *seven*, as thus employed by John, Ticonius Afer of the fourth century, and Arethas of Cappadocia who belonged to the sixth, accord; as many other interpreters in ancient and modern times have also done. But still there is some variety of opinion among interpreters of this class. The distinguished abbot Joachim (Cent. 12), Grotius, Vitringa, and others, suppose the various states of the seven churches in Asia, to designate the various conditions in which the

* See. in Biblioth. Max. Patrum, Tom. III. p. 414 seq.

church of Christ will successively be, down to the end of the world; see Vitr. in Apoc. p. 32. But even among those who defend this last peculiar and *mystic* sense of the epistle to the seven churches, there is not an entire concord of views. One class, for example, hold that the interpretation is to be purely and solely mystical; and these assign even to the proper *names* employed in the epistles to the seven churches, a mystical meaning. Thus Ἀσία is said to mean *elatio*, a symbolical designation for the race of man which is elevated; Ἔφεσος means *remission*, = ἄφεσις, and so means *she who has remitted her first love*, etc.; Σμύρνα means *the excellent myrrh-perfume of the cross*, etc.; and thus through the whole circle of the seven names. In this way, there is no vestige left of any special relation of the Apocalypse to the churches of Asia. But another class of the mystical interpreters, justly apprehending that such egregious trifling as this can never be rendered tolerable to the community of critics, have conceded that there is a literal sense, which ought not to be overlooked, in the addresses and inscriptions to the churches; while, as they aver, there is also a secondary and mystical sense which is by far the more noble and excellent, inasmuch as it has respect to the condition of the churches down to the end of time.

Vitringa has attempted to defend this last position at length, in his Commentary on Rev. 1: 20. I deem it unnecessary to examine his arguments at length in respect to this matter. Suffice it merely to suggest a few hints. (1) The *double* sense which Vitringa assumes, is wholly inadmissible, on any grounds of sober and rational exegesis. (2) If the *states* of the church universal are represented by the seven epistles, then are they inconsistent with each other, and even contradictory. To avoid this, Vitringa assumes that they are *successive*. But what is there elsewhere in all the Bible to show, that the church is successively to put on the phases of character here indicated; and specially, to show that her last state, near the end of time, and after all her enemies are conquered, will be like to that of the church at Laodicea? The whole structure of such an edifice must be regarded as a mere castle in the air. It is indeed the offspring of nothing but imagination; for there is not one word in the prologue or epilogue of the Apocalypse, adapted to establish any conclusions of this kind, or to favour the indulgence of such imaginations. The whole is mere gratuitous assumption; assumption, moreover, which in no sense whatever adds to the significancy, the dignity, or the importance of the Apocalypse. John, when he addressed the seven churches of Asia, expected, and might well expect, that what he said to those churches would apply and be profitable to all other churches, just so far as the circumstances of other churches should resemble those of the Christians in Asia. The case is of exactly the same nature as that of Paul's epistles. These are addressed to par-

ticular churches; they are adapted to their wants and woes, their errors and their virtues, their dangers and their trials, their outward pressures and their inward struggles. Of course, inasmuch as men, and Christians, are essentially the same in all ages, so the admonitions and instructions of Paul, with very few exceptions, will be useful, and in this sense adapted, to all generations down to the end of time. Even so with the Apocalyptic epistles. Consequently the mode of exegesis which regards them as originally addressed to specific churches, does not abate in any degree from the highest usefulness which can be assigned to them. No ground of interpretation which is firm, can make them applicable and useful at all times and in all places, beyond the line now drawn. None can make them more useful within that line, than the one just proposed. Mysticism is quite out of place, in such a matter as this. All there is about it, which has any appearance of the mystical or the symbolical, is, that just *seven* churches, and no more, are addressed. Other churches there were in that near neighbourhood. There were churches at Colosse, at Magnesia, at Tralles; doubtless there were churches also at other places in the neighbourhood of all the seven churches addressed; but John has named only seven. Some reason for this there was, beyond a doubt. It might be the fact, that John was more acquainted with those seven churches, than with others. It might be, that the seven were more considerable and numerous. It might be, that they were in greater need of admonition, or encouragement. Or, (what is far more probable still), *seven*, and only so many, may have been named, because the sevenfold divisions and groups of various kinds and of various objects, constitute a conspicuous feature in the form of the Apocalypse throughout. It would even have been incongruous with the rest of the book, had more than seven churches been addressed. One has only to become familiar with the structure of the book, and all necessity of argument in this case is superseded. Nothing more is requisite than to suppose, that the number is limited to seven merely for the sake of congruity; and that so many, moreover, are addressed, in order that all the usual varieties of condition and character, among the Christians of that time, should be brought under the writer's inspection and receive appropriate counsel from him. When Luke wrote his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, although he did so in particular for the sake of Theophilus, does any one suppose, that he designed that his books should be confined within a circle so narrow? Or did Paul, when he wrote to the Romans, Corinthians, or others, design or wish that his epistles should be confined within the limits of those respective churches? If such a thing may be imagined, it cannot well be believed. Even so with John. There may be, there doubtless was, good reason why his book should be peculiarly addressed to seven

churches; but there was and is good reason, why what he has written should enure to the benefit of all the churches.

Mystical interpretation, then, is out of place here. The natural and obvious sense of words is never to be departed from, when the meaning is significant, congruous, accordant with historical facts, and worthy of the cause of Christianity and of the writer. All these requisitions are answered by the simple historical interpretation of proper names and places, as exhibited in the inscriptions of John's seven epistles. And such being the case, further dispute in relation to the subject would seem to be superfluous.

I pass on, then, to other topics; but I must not pass, however, without briefly adverting beforehand to the peculiar views of Herder and Harenberg, who have distinguished themselves so much by writing upon the Apocalypse. In particular, Herder refers everything, in the body of the work, to the destruction of Judea and Jerusalem. But then comes the problem: How could John address to seven churches in *Asia*, what was intended for the churches of *Judea*? His solution is curious. He says, that 'the sending of the book to Palestine was unnecessary, because the discourse of our Saviour respecting the destruction of Jerusalem was well known there already; and then the additional disclosures in the Apocalypse respecting troubles and sufferings yet to come, would have tormented and discouraged the churches there;' Maran Atha, p. 281 seq. One can scarcely credit the testimony of his eyes, when he reads such a passage in Herder. So then, John's attempt to write a book in order to encourage, animate, and console Christians, was a failure; and had it been sent to the place for which it was designed, would have done more harm than good! It follows of course, that John must have been very poorly employed in writing it; and moreover, he must have been a very different sort of a writer, from the John whom Herder has characterized as the author of the Apocalypse.

Harenberg also avers, that the Apocalypse was written for *Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem*, and that all the leading parts of it have respect only to Palestine. The book everywhere presupposes readers, he says, who are acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and with all the Jewish rites, ceremonies, and Cabbala. And when the question forces itself upon him: Why then did John address the seven churches of *Asia*? he has a most singular answer to give. 'The Jews of Asia,' says he, 'had at Jerusalem separate schools and synagogues. The ground on which these stood, was named *Asia*. The number of schools upon that ground was seven; and these bore, respectively, the names which appear in the inscriptions to the seven epistles; like the English schools at Rome, in the 8th century, which bore the names of the Heptarchy;' Erklärung, etc., p. 67 seq. To refute this, no reader will now require.

If men who have studied the Apocalypse so much as Herder and Harenberg, and done so much to explain and vindicate it in various respects, are driven to such conceits, in order to save their peculiar theory respecting the interpretation of the book, it is enough to show that their theory cannot be correct. Indeed it lies upon the face of the Apocalypse, that, after the close of chap. xi, another power than that of the Jews is concerned, and another country than that of Palestine.

In a word, neither the state of facts, nor the laws of interpretation, require or even permit us to suppose, that the original readers to whom the Apocalypse was addressed, were other and different from those who are named in the inscription of the book. With all tender affection and earnestness the writer greets them; to them he commends the reading and study of his book; and on them he makes the most solemn injunction neither to add to nor detract from it. What good reason now can any one give, for supposing all this to be a mere imaginary and symbolic matter? John wrote for somebody; he had readers; and his work itself assigns the place where he lived, and the near neighbourhood of it, as the circle within which he first of all designed to exert an influence by writing his book. Can anything be more natural, more probable, more easy to be believed, than that the Apocalypse has given a true account with respect to the original readers, and the places where they lived?

What is there, moreover, in the contents of the book, which prevents our giving entire credit to the account which the Apocalypse itself obviously appears to give of all these matters? Will it be said, that the *Asiatic* Jews had little concern with the persecutions or the destiny of Judea? This cannot be true. All the great cities of Asia Minor were full of Jews. Many of these, even of the Christian party, went up to the yearly feasts, because they still clave to the law of Moses. All had much sympathy for the land of their fathers—i. e. for the holy land and the holy temple. Personal annoyance of Hebrew Christians from abroad, when they visited Palestine in the days of persecution, was in all probability not an uncommon thing. At any rate, Hebrew Christians abroad must sympathize deeply with those in their native country, who were the subjects of a bloody persecution. Asiatic Christians, therefore, would be highly interested readers of the Apocalypse, and particularly of that part of it which has respect to Palestine. If any one, now, will reverse the case, and make the supposition, that the Hebrew Christians of Palestine are addressed; then, on the same ground, we might ask: What interest could they have in chap. xii—xix? But in neither case would this be anything more than a mere show of argument. We cannot suppose, with any probability, that John expected or designed that his work should be limited only to one circle of readers.

It must soon have been somewhat widely diffused, on account of the deeply interesting subjects of which it treated; so that whoever the original readers were, it matters not, except merely as the question is connected with historical criticism. In regard to this, however, the question is one of great importance. If it can be shown that everything of this nature, i. e. everything which respects the readers, or the place or the time of the writing, is natural and probable, skepticism in regard to the book becomes less and less excusable.

Yet one thing, it is said, is wanting in respect to the Asiatic churches. The Apocalypse was written about A. D. 68, when persecution was indeed carried on at Rome with great fury; but not in the *provinces* of the Roman empire. Consequently there is only an *apprehended* or *anticipative* persecution to be found in the Apocalypse, and the writer merely fortifies his readers against the days of trial which he supposes are coming.

Of late this opinion has become somewhat frequent. Neander, Lücke, Gieseler, and others appear to favour it. But I cannot persuade myself that such a position is well-founded. The opinion that the persecution began at Rome in A. D. 64, and that it spread and *became general in the provinces*, was the prevailing opinion of antiquity. In modern times it has had strenuous and able defenders. Baldwin, in his *Comm. ad Edicta Imper.;* Launoius, in his *Dissert. ad loc. Sulpit. Severi;* Dodwell, in his *Dissertt. Cypr.;* and Mosheim, in his *Hist. Ecc.*, and also in his larger work *De Rebus Christ.* etc.; as also many others, defend the ancient opinion. This is not the place minutely to pursue a historical investigation respecting it; for the authors named, or at least some of them, may be easily consulted. In the sequel, however, I shall advert to a few passages of ancient testimony. What I would say here is, that the evidences of a wide spread persecution of Christians, before the fall of Jerusalem and among the Roman provinces, seems to be plain and frequent, not only in the Apocalypse, but in the Epistles of the New Testament. The Apocalypse commences with a statement, that the writer is in exile at Patmos, "on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ," Rev. 1: 9. The church at Ephesus is commended for its *patience* and endurance of evil, and a peculiar reward is promised *to him that overcometh* in the great contest that is supposed to be going on, 2: 3, 7. The church at Smyrna is spoken of as in a suffering state, and as exposed to be cast into prison by Satan, 2: 10. The church at Pergamos dwells where Satan has his seat, and has already witnessed the death of the faithful martyr Antipas, 2: 13. To the church at Philadelphia the promise is made, that they shall be kept *in the hour of trial that is coming upon all the world*, 3: 10. In every case, the close of the epistle to each church contains a promise τῷ νι-

νῶντι, to him who is victor, viz. in the great contest which was evidently going on. All the writer's earnest warnings, counsels, and encouragements, appear to have their basis mainly in such a state of things. The very structure and theme of the whole book indicates the same state. What is all the struggle, and what are all the victories? The struggle is with *persecutors;* the victories are over the enemies and the wasters of the church, first in Palestine, then through the Romish empire. Accordingly the great army presented in chap. vi, is the symbol of destruction to the persecutors of the church. This is made definitely certain, by Rev. 6: 10, 11. Verse 11 indeed renders it certain, that when the book was written, or at any rate when the vision was seen, the persecution was then going on, and many more martyrs were still to be made. This would decide against putting off the composition of the book until after Nero's death, in case it respects persecution out of Palestine; for all agree, that persecution ceased immediately, in the Roman empire, after the death of Nero. But here, persecution in *Judea* is the theme of the writer. Chap. xi. represents a scene of persecution in the very last stages of the war in Palestine; for the writer evidently means by this representation, to show the aggravated guilt of the Jews, and how well they deserved the punishment inflicted upon them. In chap. xii, Satan, having been foiled in his attempt to destroy the Saviour, is exhibited as greatly enraged against Christians, and woe to the inhabitants of the earth is predicted, by reason of his enmity. In chap. xiii. we find Satan, the beast, and the false prophet, all combined to oppress, persecute, and destroy Christians. Some of them are sent into exile, and some are slain with the sword, 13: 10. I can scarcely doubt, that in this passage John touches his own case, and threatens a violent death to Nero because of his bloody persecutions. Rome is presented in 17: 6, as "drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." And when her destruction comes, apostles and prophets are called to rejoice that God hath avenged *them* on her—her who had so long persecuted and destroyed the church. Interspersed everywhere are passages, which show a deep feeling on the subject of present and urgent persecution. The martyrs who remain steadfast unto death, or (as the writer expresses himself) *die in the Lord*, are pronounced peculiarly blessed, 14: 13. To crown all, the first resurrection, the living and reigning with Christ a thousand years, is held out as the peculiar reward of those, *who are beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God*, 20: 4. And when the awful curse is brought to view, which will rest on those that are excluded from the new Jerusalem, the *fearful* and *unconfiding*, i. e. those who have renounced Christianity in the day of trial by persecutions, are placed in the front rank of the condemned, 21: 8. In fact, at the very outset, the writer, in

stating his exile to Patmos, declares that he is an ἀδελφός in affliction, and a συγκοινωνός in the same with those whom he addresses. In a word; Christians were suffering everywhere, at any rate in Asia Minor as well as at Rome. The whole manner and matter of the Apocalypse, then, bears the most indelible marks of having originated *ingruenti persecutione*, i. e. whilst persecution was raging. There is no room for mistake in this matter. Of course, if written before the destruction of Jerusalem, as it evidently was, it must have been written under Nero's reign, i. e. before the persecution ceased; for it did cease immediately after his death.

When Peter wrote his first epistle to the regions of Asia Minor, including some of the most distant ones, persecution was then and there raging; as is plain from 1 Pet. 1: 6, 7. 2: 20, 21. 3: 14, 17. 4: 1, 7, 13—19. 5: 9. James, who seems to have addressed foreign Hebrew Christians in general, begins with counsel to those who are subjected to *severe trials*, 1: 2—4; and to this condition he afterwards adverts, 2: 6. 5: 6—11. Disclosures of a similar nature are not wanting in Paul's latest epistles; e. g. the second to Timothy and the epistle to the Hebrews, chap. x. xii, (that is, allowing their genuineness), and in some others. The persecutions elsewhere mentioned by Paul, are partial and local, for they belong to earlier periods.

Such is the tenor of most of the later portions of the New Testament. No wonder that Ewald, after adverting to the recent opinion that Nero's persecution was limited to the city of Rome, says, in respect to its *general* extension, especially in Asia Minor, that "the proofs of it are so manifest, *ut quo jure dubitemus non appareat*," p. 2.

The earlier Christian histories have perished, so that we cannot draw from them directly any confirmation of the views that have now been given. Eusebius (II. 25) has only a short paragraph on the persecution of Nero. He speaks of him as the enemy of the Christian religion, and the first of the Roman emperors who persecuted it; and then he describes the martyrdom of Paul and of Peter under Nero's reign. In his account of the persecution of Domitian (III. 17), he says that this emperor was the follower of Nero in his hatred and persecution of Christians, and that he was the second who persecuted the church. Neither here, nor in the preceding account, does Eusebius give any express limitation to the persecutions of either emperor, but speaks of both in the same general way. Sulpicius Severus, however, about A. D. 408, in his Historiae Sacrae (II. 28), speaks of Nero as first endeavouring to extinguish the name of Christians. After relating the destruction of many at Nero's command, by wild beasts, by crucifixion, and by fire, he goes on to say, that "the [Christian] religion was forbidden by the enactment of laws (datis legibus); and, by edicts published (edictis

propositis), it was lawful for no one openly to be a Christian," (ib. cap. 29).

It has been disputed, whether Nero did in fact issue any edicts of the character here described. But we have a much earlier authority than Sulpicius for this. "Consulite *commentarios* vestros," says Tertullian; "illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc [Christianam] sectam, tum maxime Romae orientem, Caesariano gladio ferocisse; Apolog. adv. Gentes, cap. V. Does not the word *commentarios* here plainly mean the same thing as the *edicts* mentioned by Sulpicius?* Orosius, who was a contemporary of Jerome and Augustine and much respected by them, (as was Sulpicius also), says in his Historiae (VII. 7): [Nero] "first persecuted Christians at Rome by torture and death, and *he commanded that* IN ALL THE PROVINCES *they should be tormented by the like persecution.* He even laboured to extirpate the very name of Christians, and slew the apostles of Christ, Peter by crucifixion, and Paul by the sword." Indeed, nothing can be more probable than this account of Orosius, confirmed by Tertullian and Sulpicius. The character of Nero is a good voucher for the possibility, or rather the probability, of such

* That *legibus* and *edictis* mean the same thing, in the extract from Sulpicius above, as *commentarios* in this passage of Tertullian, there is scarcely any room for doubt. Both the words *Edictum* and *Commentarii* were used in a wide sense. Among the Romans, the *edict* of the Praetor meant the system of rules which he proclaimed, when entering on his office, as his guide in the administration of its duties. In allusion to this, other magistrates called some of their proclamations *edicts;* so that the Roman historians speak of the *edicts* of kings, consuls, dictators, censors, tribunes, quaestors, etc. It is much the same with *Commentarii.* At first this word meant *memoirs* of any individual; then it was used in the extended sense of *memorabilia*, and applied to short notes of a discourse, extracts from any book, etc. Finally the *Acta Publica*, or public registers of the city, were called *commentarii.* Livy speaks of the commentarii of king Numa; and Cicero, of the commentaries of kings, of Caesar, etc.; evidently meaning ordinances, rules, memoranda of things to be done, etc. In this way we may easily see how Nero could persecute Christians without any formal law of the Senate to this purpose; (for we read of no such law on the part of the Senate, nor, of course, do we hear anything of its *repeal* after the death of Nero). Nero was by office the supreme Executive of the State. According to the Twelve Tables only the *religio licita* was lawful for a Roman citizen, or any one dwelling in the Roman provinces. Nero, therefore, by an *edict* as supreme minister of Justice, or by *commentarii* in his notes for the use of executive officers, could wage a war of extermination against Christians without any difficulty. But as such an edict or commentary was merely and only personal, and belonged not to proper legislation but to the Executive, his death would of course annul it, unless his successor chose to continue it. But as Galba did not wish to persecute Christians, the matter, already become very odious by reason of the horrid cruelties that had been practised, was dropped of course when he succeeded Nero. The deep silence of ecclesiastical historians as to the *manner* in which this persecution of Nero commenced and terminated, is my apology for this long note of explanation.

a measure. Moreover the war against Judea had everywhere roused up the enmity of the heathen against the hated race of the Hebrews. The Jews, in many places, were seditious and tumultuous. And as they were, at that early period, confounded with the Christians by most or all of the heathen nations, and had always been the objects of enmity and scorn and contempt on the part of the heathen, nothing can be more probable, than that the Roman provinces would follow the example of the capital; specially after the commencement of the Jewish war. In addition to all this, Christianity was uncompromising with everything pertaining to idolatry and polytheism. The heathen priests were, in particular, exceedingly jealous of Christians, and much enraged against them. Most graphically is this feature of the times depicted, by the symbol of the second beast in Rev. xiii. If any one needs confirmation of these declarations respecting the state of things in regard to the Jews, he may consult Jahn's Hebrew Commonwealth, § 135 seq. Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, II. p. 295 seq. 320 seq.

When all the considerations thus brought to view are combined, can it be possible to doubt that the Apocalypse was written in "troublous times," in the midst of furious persecution, and when Christianity greatly needed encouragement, consolation, and admonition? The whole book bears throughout the stamp of such an impression.

Thus much for the state of things, which attended and occasioned the writing of the Apocalypse. It is unnecessary for me, after having said so much on this subject, to dwell upon *the object to be aimed at*, or *the end to be attained*, in the writing of the Revelation. Already has this topic been brought to view, and in some good degree anticipated, in p. 155 seq. above. Only a few considerations more need to be added here.

I may repeat here what I have already had occasion to say more than once, viz. that to encourage, animate, confirm, and comfort Christians in a state of suffering and peril, must needs be conceded, by every impartial reader of the Apocalypse, to be the prominent design of the book. As the *sole* object, we are not obliged to represent it. John, like other sacred writers, may have had more than one particular end in view. He intended to *instruct*, as well as console and encourage. He expected that the then urgent persecutions would not be the only ones which Christians would be called to suffer. He has widened and extended his views of the contest, toward the closing part of his book. He has thus made the principles which it recognizes, applicable to all times and places. The final, complete, and certain triumph of the church is portrayed. All Christians of every period may take encouragement from this, and be consoled by it. But the distant future, as before remarked, is presented in mere *outlines*. It is, as it were, the

back ground of his picture, drawn in colours less vivid and strong. Yet it is an integral part of it, and the picture would be incomplete without it.

Such a view of the writer's design accounts easily for the prominence which he has given to the then present and existing state of things. He wrote specially for his *συγκοινωνοί in affliction*. He has given all due attention to their case, and opened before them the vista, which discloses the more distant and peaceful future of the church. But as their then present situation called forth his work, it was to be expected that the work should be mainly occupied with it. Hence the persecuting powers of the Jews and of the Romans, with their respective fall and ruin, present themselves before his vision until he has made a full disclosure of their fearful destruction.

What respects the address only to seven churches by name, has already been the subject of remark. Be the main reason of this the prominence of those churches, their dangerous condition, or John's peculiar relation to them and care for them, or be it that the number *seven* is grounded merely on the *heptades* exhibited in the main part of the book, it matters not. John doubtless had reasons for addressing seven churches; and it matters not to us what they were, so far as the interpretation of the book is concerned.

That an address to so many churches, at such a period, would naturally find its way among most or all of the churches, in similar circumstances, it is easy to suppose and is quite probable. Hence the circulation of the book. The instruction to be drawn from it, when rightly viewed, is applicable indeed to Christians at all times. But still, the poetic costume of the work, and the difficulty in understanding some of its symbols, may have early impeded in some measure the wide and rapid diffusion of the Apocalypse. Hence the eastern Syrians had and have it not in their Canon; and some of the western Christians occasionally doubted or denied its place in the Canon. But of this, more in its appropriate place.

I will only add, that the special relations of John to the seven churches of Asia developes itself so plainly in his mode of addressing those churches, that it needs no confirmation. He must have been a man of high consideration among them, and of much familiar acquaintance with them, in order to entitle him to such a style of address and exhortation as he employs. In the sequel, this consideration will be reverted to, when we come to examine the question: Who wrote the Apocalypse? Is *John* an *assumed* name? Does it mean John the Evangelist, or John the Presbyter of Ephesus? For the present, it suffices to have brought into view the relation of the writer of the Apocalypse to the seven churches, as one of the considerations connected with the inquiry respecting the original readers of the Apocalypse, and the design of the work.

§ 14. *Original Language of the Apocalypse.*

The language in which the Apocalypse comes down to us from antiquity, is *Hebrew-Greek*. The tradition of the churches has uniformly been, that it was originally composed in this language. The most ancient witnesses in regard to this matter, speak of no other than an original *Greek* text. The churches addressed in the Apocalypse, at any rate the great mass of them, spoke Greek; and probably by far the greater number of Christians in them did not understand Hebrew. Even if we should suppose that a majority of the seven churches were converted Jews, it is not probable that the mass of the Jews in Asia read familiarly and understood the Hebrew, or the Hebrew Aramaean, language. Why then should John write in that language? And particularly, if, as we have good reason to believe, the Apocalypse was designed for circulation among the persecuted churches, why should John have written in a language that but few could read? External testimony, the encyclical design of the composition, the language of the persons addressed, all combine to render it entirely probable that John wrote in Hebrew-Greek.

In such Greek the author must write, if he wrote in Greek at all. That he was himself a *Hebrew*, every page of his writing testifies, whether one looks at the matter or the manner. No writer in the New Testament has, on the whole, displayed so much and so minute a knowledge of the Hebrew prophets, as the writer of the Apocalypse. He seems to have them wholly at his command. Instead of citing them *literally*, as one is always prone to do when he feels that his knowledge of them is imperfect and may lead him into mistake if he cites freely, he has everywhere embodied Old Testament ideas in his composition, without making, in any one instance, a mere literal quotation of a passage of any considerable length from the ancient Scriptures. Not a single formula of quotation, such as *λέγει*, *μαρτυρεῖ*, *γέγραπται γάρ*, *καθὼς γέγραπται*, etc., anywhere occurs. So familiar are Old Testament ideas to the author, that he scarcely seems to be conscious that he is citing them when they are produced by him. His manner of employing them seems to indicate, that they have been so often revolved in his mind as to become a part of the stores which properly belong to it. From these stores, as from his own conceptions, he draws whatever is adapted to his purpose; and he clothes all these ideas in his own language, following closely neither the Hebrew nor the Greek Scriptures. One might well doubt, whether he once opened the Old Testament for the sake of copying a citation, during the composition of his book.

Such an evident familiarity with the Hebrew prophetic Scriptures,

and such entire freedom in the use of the ideas which they exhibit, must be considered as evidence nearly or quite conclusive, that John read easily and familiarly the Old Testament Hebrew. If John the *apostle* was the author of this book, the high style of thinking and reasoning, which he has exhibited in his *doctrinal* Gospel, would plead strongly in favour of the position that he was well versed in the Hebrew Scriptures. Conceding that his vernacular tongue was *Aramaean-Hebrew*, yet the ease with which one passes from this to the more ancient Hebrew, is very great, and it could cost a thinking man, like John, but a few days of study, in order to read Hebrew with great ease. The probability certainly is, considering the character of his parents, that he was taught the Hebrew in his childhood. His *occupation* as a fisherman makes nothing against this. Was not Paul a *tent-maker*?

His Greek style, then, must be of the Hebrew cast; for, whoever he was, he was a Hebrew by birth and education; he was one by his early religion. Assuming that the apostle John was the author of the Apocalypse, we may further say, that when he wrote the book he had recently come to Ephesus from Palestine, and his *Hebraism* would be the more palpable on account of his limited practice, as yet, in speaking and writing Greek. No book in all the New Testament is so Hebraistic as the Revelation. I would not, however, put this merely to the account of John's imperfect knowledge of the Greek at the time when the book was written, (inasmuch as his choice of words and manner of compounding them show no very limited or scanty knowledge of this tongue); for my belief is, that it is mainly to be attributed to the writer's minute familiarity with the Hebrew prophets, whose modes of expression and peculiar idioms he often, and as it were unconsciously, imitates. In fact, the style of the Apocalypse wears the appearance of having been conceived by a mind, which had incorporated with its own stores those of the Hebrew prophets. How natural for the writer in such a condition, to think and speak *more Hebraico!*

It makes but little, then, for the position that the Apocalypse had a *Hebraeo-Aramaean original*, that it is now full of Hebraisms. So is Matthew, and Mark, and Luke even, full of Hebraisms; so do Paul and James and Peter abound in them. It is the common character of the New Testament Greek. If the Apocalypse is more strongly tinctured than any other book, it is because its style, manner of composition, and frequent references to Old Testament prophets, make it more to resemble an Old Testament production in its manner, than any other book of the New Testament. The affinity between the Apocalypse and Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, not to mention other prophets, is too plain to admit of any denial.

The attempts to find any palpable proofs of a Hebrew *original*, in

respect to the Apocalypse, are not of consideration enough to deserve a serious notice. Bolten is the only critic of any name, who has defended such a position; but his extravagance in assigning such an original to all the New Testament books, is well known; and long since has it been proscribed by nearly if not quite all respectable critics.

It has been thought by some, that the number of *Hebrew* words, which are employed in the Apocalypse, give some indication of a Hebrew original. But if we are to take them as now presented to us, they are rather to be regarded as proofs of the contrary; inasmuch as the writer has himself taken pains to translate them for his readers. It might be said, that this is the work of the *translator*. But why has he limited himself to so narrow a circle, in retaining the original words, if this be a matter referable only to his own judgment?

It seems at first to be rather remarkable, that John should so often have translated such words as ἀμήν and Σατανᾶς; e. g. ναί, ἀμήν, 1: 7. 22: 20; and ἀμήν = ἀληθινός or πιστός in 3: 14; Σατανᾶς = διάβολος in 12: 9 and 20: 2. See also Ἀβαδδών = Ἀπολλύων in 9: 11. In another case, viz. ἀλληλούϊα in 19: 1, 3, 4, 6, no translation is made. All these words were as common, probably, in the primitive churches, as they now are in ours, and consequently as well understood. Ἀμήν and ἀλληλούϊα belong to the Jewish liturgy; and Σατανᾶς and Ἀβαδδών must have been frequent among Jewish Christians. But in some of these cases, an intensity of meaning is given by the repetition in different languages. Nor is this usage at all uncommon in other New Testament writings. Thus in John 1: 39, 42, 43. 9: 7; where the word ἑρμηνεύεται is connected with a Greek translation. But in John 19: 13, 17, the word λέγεται is so connected; (comp. Rev. 12: 9, καλούμενος; 20: 2, ἐστί; 9: 11, ὄνομα ἔχει). To gather evidence, as some have endeavoured to do, from the use of Hebrew words in the Apocalypse, that the book has a different author from the Evangelist John, seems to be uncritical. John's Gospel exhibits the same usage, as may be seen above; and so does almost every part of the New Testament; sometimes with an express notice of an interpretation (ἑρμηνευόμενον, μεθερμηνευόμενον, τοῦτ' ἔστι, etc.), as in Matt. 1: 23. 27: 46. Mark 5: 41 (ταλιθὰ κοῦμι). 7: 34. 15: 22, 34. Acts 4: 36. 13: 8. Heb. 7: 2; sometimes without such notice, as ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, Mark 14: 36. Rom. 8: 15; sometimes without either notice or translation, as 1 Cor. 16: 22, μαρὰν ἀθά; and so of ἀμήν in scores of cases. Whoever carefully examines these cases, will find that no particular formula of introducing Hebrew words is appropriate to any one writer; for the same writer uses one form in one place, and another in a different place. So it is with John, in his Gospel; 1: 39, 42, 43. 9: 7 exhibit one form; 19: 13, 17 exhibit another; and in more than fifty cases ἀμήν is used without expla-

nation. So in the Apocalypse, 9: 11. 12: 9. 20: 2, there are formulas; in 1: 7. 22: 20. 19: 1, 3, 4, 6 there are none, and in the last four cases no translation. And in this last way, ἀμήν is frequently employed. To say, with some recent critics, that because ἑρμηνεύεται is employed in John's Gospel, and not in the Apocalypse, therefore the writer of the two books must be different, is surely a very important conclusion drawn from very inadequate and slender premises. Three out of four of the cases in the Gospel are all in the same short paragraph, and are but the mere repetition of the same formula as applied to different words in the same way, (John 1: 39, 42, 43). Every one, who is well acquainted with the writings of John, must know that it is characteristic of him, when a particular method of speaking is once introduced in a connected paragraph, to carry on that *modus* through the paragraph, so often as he has occasion to introduce the same idea. So is it with ἀμήν in John iii; so with several forms of expression in the last addresses of Jesus to his disciples, chap. xiv—xvii; so with the almost constant use of the *historic* present tense, in 1: 15 ad fin., 13: 4 ad fin., and chap. xx. xxi. In those portions of John's Gospel last referred to, a great part of all the historic present tenses in the book are contained. No weight, therefore, can be justly attached to such an argument as that which we are examining.

As connected with the subject of the original language of the Apocalypse, may be considered the question: *What Scriptures did the writer consult and quote? The original Hebrew, or the Greek, i. e. the Septuagint?*

This is a question somewhat difficult. Often as the author of the Apocalypse has for substance quoted the Old Testament—even more often than it is quoted or alluded to in any other book of the New Testament—yet, as has already been said, he has not in a single instance used the common formula of quotation. It is quite apparent, that his quotations and allusions everywhere flow from his own full mind and memory. They do not wear the appearance of being searched after for the occasion, and then copied verbatim, but of being made from memory, and of flowing from the spontaneous incorporation of Old Testament ideas with his own, so that they receive their hue from his own method of thought and expression. Hence the difficulty of settling the question, whether he followed the Septuagint or the Hebrew. Safely may we answer, that he has followed neither κατὰ πόδα. The ideas from the Old Testament which he introduces, might have been drawn from either. In Rev. 1: 7, he has manifestly departed from the Septuagint, (which has κατωρχήσαντο and not ἐξεκέντησαν), and conformed more closely to the Hebrew. So again in 2: 27, comp. Ps. 2: 9 in the Septuagint. In many other passages, there is a close approximation to

modes of expression in the Septuagint, e. g. in 7: 9. 10: 11. 11: 9. 12: 14. 10: 5. 5: 5. 22: 16, and other passages, which the reader can readily compare. Yet in these and all others, there is a freedom in the Apocalypse from any exactness of copying, which renders it difficult, if not impossible, to say whether the writer had his mind principally upon the Septuagint, or freely translated for himself, and employed an idiom which approaches very near to that of the Septuagint. All the Greek translations of the time were in the idiom of the Hebrew-Greek; so that this characteristic decides nothing *for* or *against* the use of the Septuagint by John. But the *freedom* of the citations shows one thing, at least, viz. that John most probably wrote in Greek originally; for a mere translator of the Apocalypse into Greek would have been likely to consult and follow exactly the Septuagint version of Old Testament passages. John himself could freely incorporate the sentiment of these passages with his own method of thinking and expression, whether he referred to them in Hebrew or in Greek. That he could do either, there can be no reasonable question. The author of the Apocalypse was verily "a Hebrew of the Hebrews." No book in all the New Testament, as has been said, bears so strong an impression of the Hebrew dialect as the Apocalypse. That the writer of this book was conversant with both the Septuagint and the original Hebrew, who can doubt for a moment, that well considers the character of his book? And if John the Evangelist was the author, who can doubt that such a mind as he evinces in his Gospel, would be familiar with both the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures? Yet neither this circumstance, nor any other that has been mentioned, nor any within my knowledge, is sufficient absolutely to decide the question, whether John quoted from the Hebrew or from the Greek Scriptures. Nor is it of any serious importance. Whichever he did, he is far enough from being a mere literal copyist.

§ 15.* *Peculiar characteristics of the language and style of the Apocalypse.*

On account of these, the Apocalypse has often been attacked by those who have been disposed to show this book but little favour. Even the first formidable opponent, who called in question the apostolic origin of this book, did not overlook the circumstance of its peculiar idioms. I refer to Dionysius Alexandrinus (fl. 225), who thus expresses himself: *Διάλεκτον μέντοι καὶ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἑλληνίζουσαν αὐτοῦ βλέπω· ἀλλ' ἰδιώμασι μὲν βαρβαρικοῖς χρώμενον καί που καὶ σολοικίζοντα.* That is, 'I perceive, indeed, that his dialect and language is not accurate Greek; [and not only so] but that he uses *barbarisms*, and in some places even *solecisms*;' quoted in Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VII. 25. Diony-

sius had a favourite point to carry, when he endeavoured to gain credit to these assertions; and so have many who repeat them in modern times, and urge them with great zeal upon the community. Still, there is some specious foundation on which they are built; and, with the information which is now abroad in relation to the idioms of the Greek language, we can better come to some just determination in relation to these allegations, than was feasible in ancient times, or even in modern, until the results of recent investigations were made known. The older critics, who have found fault with the idiom of the Apocalypse, have, for the most part, contented themselves with pointing out the differences between ordinary prosaic Greek and that of the Revelation. It requires, indeed, but a moderate share of acquaintance with the usual classic Greek, in order to be able to point out what have been named, (after the example of Dionysius), *barbarisms* and *solecisms* in the Apocalypse. Even a tyro, who has but learned the ordinary rules of syntax, can do this; for departures from these are of frequent occurrence in the Revelation. A more advanced state of acquaintance with Greek, however, must lead one to conclude, that there are few, if any, of the apparent anomalies in the Revelation, which may not be justified by examples of the like kind, even among the more reputable Greek authors.

First of all it is proper to inquire, whether there are not metes and bounds to the question before us, which must be well understood before we can safely advance in our inquiries. It is no valid charge against the Apocalypse, that, in common with all the New Testament books, the Septuagint, and the earlier Greek fathers, it exhibits a *Hebrew-Greek* idiom. How could we believe its author to have been a *Hebrew*, if it did not? And why should that which is common to all New Testament Greek, be made a matter of charge against the Apocalypse, or be considered as belonging to its peculiarities? Whatever there is in it which merely belongs to the idiom in question, it is of course to be exempted from an inquiry which has respect only to its *peculiarities*.

The general question being thus stated, it may be proper to premise a few remarks, which may assist in judging of the peculiarities under consideration.

I need only to advert here to the fact, that the Apocalypse is essentially a *poetic* composition, in order to gain assent from every enlightened critic, that all proper allowances should be made for this method of writing. Every age and nation has a poetic dialect, in some respects distinct from the common colloquial, or the usual prosaic, dialect. Who does not know, that the dialects of Homer, Pindar, and other poets, in Greek; of Virgil, Juvenal, and others, in Latin; of Milton, Shakspeare, and others, in English; have occasioned critics and grammarians an infinitude of labour and trouble? Yet no one presumes to regard these

peculiarities of poety as a blemish upon the composition. Often have they been appealed to, as even adding beauty and force and attractiveness to the respective works in which they are found. If John's work is poetry in its very nature, (whether rhythm i. e. measure, or not, is of no essential consequence), then why are we not naturally to expect an idiom, which is more or less peculiar to the book? Common critical justice demands that we should make an allowance for this.

It is a matter of course, that we should concede to the author of a poetic composition, (one truly so), an *excited state* of mind. Nothing can be more evident than the existence of such a state, when the Apocalypse was written. From beginning to end, it is filled with the most glowing expressions both of feeling and of imagination. A writer in this state does not stop to weigh his expressions in the scales of grammarians, nor to polish his periods according to the dictates of rhetoricians. Paul would hold but an indifferent place as a writer, if he were tried by the technical rules of grammar and rhetoric. Critical justice does not demand that either he, or the author of the Revelation, should be tried in this manner.

One more remark I must make in this place. If John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, he wrote it, in all probability, soon after leaving Palestine and going to Asia Minor. In the natural course of things, this book, written under such circumstances, would bear more frequent traces of Hebrew idiom than his later compositions, viz. the Gospel and the Epistles.

Having premised these considerations, we may now proceed to examine the principal peculiarities of language or idiom, which are appealed to as matter of accusation against the Apocalypse.

(1) 'Nouns which are in apposition or epexegetical, and also participles or adjectives which refer to or qualify a preceding noun, the writer has put into a different case from that of their antecedent noun; in doing thus he has violated one of the plainest rules of syntax.'

Examples, to which appeal is made, are of such a nature as the following: Rev. 1: 5, *ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος . . . ὁ ἄρχων, κ. τ. λ.* Rev. 5: 11, 12, *καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων . . . ζώων . . . πρεσβυτέρων . . . λέγοντες.* Rev. 14: 6, *καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον . . . λέγων.* Rev. 14: 12, *ὑπομενὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, οἱ τηροῦντες*, etc. See also the like in 2: 20. 3: 12. 9: 14. 8: 9. 17: 4. 14: 14. 21: 12. In these instances, the *Nominative* follows after an *oblique* case of its antecedent, with which case the former ought ordinarily to agree. In others there is a different order, although the principle is similar; e. g. Rev. 4: 4, *ἰδού, θρόνος . . . καθήμενος . . . Ἶρις . . . θρόνοι . . . καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους.* Rev. 7: 9, *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδού, ὄχλος . . . ἑστῶτες περιβεβλημένους*, etc. See also 20: 4. 14: 14, for the like constructions.

Instead however of naming these and the like cases in the Apocalypse *solecisms* or *barbarisms*, as has often been done; or instead of merely reckoning them as *anacolutha*, (which explains nothing); recent grammarians have very justly put them to the account of *rhetorical* method. The Nominative case naturally begins a sentence, and takes the lead in demanding attention. Where a writer wishes to continue a sentence once begun, by expository clauses which more fully define or illustrate, he may, in case he begins them with any word, (noun, or participle, or adjective), which would naturally be in apposition and in the same case with the preceding word that is to be explained, choose the Nominative case for the explanatory clause, whatever may be the case of its antecedent. Such, the reader will at once perceive, is the case with the first class of examples above exhibited. The Nominative case of the expository clause throws it of course more into notice; and it is preferred, because the *rhetorical* effect is more sought after than conformity to the technical rules of grammar. In particular, where a participle stands at the head of the subordinate clause, the Nominative may be chosen for it, because it is by usage equivalent, or nearly so, to a verb in such cases, and therefore assumes the Nominative in order to make this palpable. For illustration and confirmation, I need only refer to Bernhardy's Syntax, p. 68 seq. Lücke, Einleit. in d. Offenb. § 27, 4. Kühner's Gramm. § 508, 2, specially § 677 seq. Winer's New Testament Gramm. § 64, 2. The last writer has shown that the New Testament is full of this idiom; and Kühner, that the same is very common in some of the best Greek classics. In both the New Testament and in the classics, the *participle* is most frequently concerned with this apparent anomaly; and such is the case in respect to the Apocalypse. It is needless, therefore, in respect to such a usage, further to vindicate the writer of the Revelation. I will only subjoin two or three examples from the classics, in the way of illustration. Il. ζ, 395, *Ἀνδρομάχη, Θυγάτηρ . . . Ἠετίωνος, Ἠτίων, ὃς ἔναιεν*, etc. Il. κ, 437, *καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον, ἠδὲ μεγίστους· λευκότεροι κύνος, θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι.* Thucyd. VII. 42, *τοῖς Συρακουσίοις κατάπληξις . . . ὁρῶντες*, etc. Thucyd. III. 36, *ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς . . . ἐπικαλοῦντες.* Xenophon, Plato, Herodotus, Aeschylus, Euripides, and others, afford not a few examples of the like kind. There is nothing even peculiar, then, to the Apocalypse in the use of these rhetorical modes of speech. The most that can be said is, that they are somewhat more frequent here, than elsewhere in the New Testament; but in this there is nothing strange, when the nature of the book is once considered. One might even say, that of course constructions of this nature are to be expected.

The second class of cases, above specified, belong to a somewhat different construction. In Rev. 4: 4, *ἰδού* precedes; in Rev. 20: 4, *εἶδον*;

in 7: 9. 14: 14, *εἶδον καὶ ἰδού*. In the construction of the three latter cases, it seems clear that *εἶδον* is carried along in the writer's mind, and made to bear on the Accusative, where this is employed; while the Nominative cases in the same consecution are employed (as usual) after *ἰδού*. In Rev. 20: 4, this is plain in respect to *εἶδον*; in 7: 9. 14: 14, both constructions appear, viz. the Nominative after *ἰδού* and the Accusative after *εἶδον*; and in 4: 4, although only *ἰδού* is expressed, it is evident that the writer mentally and very naturally supplied an *εἶδον*. In mere common prose this would not be usual, and therefore would not be expected; in a composition like that of the Apocalypse, it is surely nothing strange. In 13, 3, *μίαν* is doubtless governed by the *εἶδον* of the preceding verse, which is mentally carried forward.

That constructions of such a nature as those just described were not understood by the author of the Apocalypse, is a most improbable supposition. How comes it to pass, that he has exhibited so much knowledge, elsewhere, even of many of the nicer idioms of the Greek, and yet was ignorant in regard to the true nature of constructions like those above? And the like remark might well be repeated, in respect to most of the apparent anomalies which follow.

(2) A second charge of anomaly against the Apocalypse is, that '*concord as to number and gender is not duly observed.*'

For the most part, this charge has very little foundation. E. g. all those cases of *constructio ad sensum*, which are found everywhere in the New Testament, and in all good Greek authors, establish no good basis for such a charge; and such cases are 4: 8, *ζῶα . . . λέγοντες*, where the living creatures are considered and spoken of as being *rational;* 5: 13, *πᾶν κτίσμα . . . ἃ . . . λέγοντας*, where the same remark applies to the masculine participle; 6: 9, *τὰς ψυχὰς . . . λέγοντες*, where *ψυχάς* means *men;* 8: 7, *χάλαζα καὶ πῦρ μεμιγμένα ἐν αἵματι*, where *μεμιγμένα* follows the *gender* of the nearest antecedent, but the *number* is made plural because it necessarily extends to two objects which were mixed with the blood; 11: 15, *φωναὶ . . . λέγοντες*, the writer's mind is upon the *angels* who speak; 13: 3, 4, *ἐθαύμασεν ὅλη ἡ γῆ . . . καὶ προσεκύνησαν . . . λέγοντες*, first a verb singular according with *ἡ γῆ*, then a verb plural because *γῆ* is a noun of multitude, then a participle masculine plural, because *men* are meant; 14: 3, *χιλιάδες, οἱ ἠγορασμένοι*, where *χιλιάδες* designates *thousands of men;* 17: 16, *τὰ δέκα κέρατα . . . καὶ τὸ θηρίον, οὗτοι μισήσουσιν*, where *οὗτοι* is employed *ad sensum*, because *men* are meant; 19: 1, *ὄχλου πολλοῦ . . . λεγόντων*, where *ὄχλου* is a noun of multitude; 19: 14, *τὰ στρατεύματα . . . ἠκολουθεῖ . . . ἐνδεδυμένοι*, etc., the first verb following the usual construction (in the singular) with the neuter plural, and the participle the *constructio ad sensum.*

Instances of this nature are to be found everywhere; and they scarcely need our particular attention. See and comp. Gen. 15: 1. 45: 1. (Sept).

Apparently more difficult or harsh is the construction in 4: 3. [ἡ]ἶρις . . . ὅμοιος ὁράσει, etc. But adjectives in -ιος, -ιμος, -ειος, -αιος, are often employed by the best Attic writers as having only *two* endings; and of course, ὅμοιος may be feminine. The author was at liberty to take his choice; and in 4: 6. 9: 19. 18: 18 he has employed the usual feminine form of this adjective, which shows that he was not ignorant of it. See Passow, Lex. sub voce, and my N. Test. Gramm. § 32. 1. *c.* Winer's N. Test. Gramm. § 47. In Rev. 14: 19, τὴν ληνὸν . . . τὸν μέγαν makes a difficulty. But here, as in the case above, the author had his choice of genders; for the Greek has both ὁ and ἡ ληνός. In common prose it would be singular to join the masculine adjective with the marked feminine τὴν ληνόν; but in a composition like that of the Apocalypse, the usual technical rules of grammar are not to be rigorously urged. It is clear, from 14: 20. 19: 15, that the author knew and also recognized the feminine gender of ληνός. It would seem, therefore, that he *purposely* wrote τὸν μέγαν in the case before us; perhaps because the θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, which immediately precedes, was in his mind and gave rise to the masculine adjective; perhaps because he meant to form an unusual construction which still was a lawful one. The case in 19: 6, φωνὴν ὄχλου . . . ὑδάτων . . . βροντῶν . . . λεγόντων is easy of solution. The participle λεγόντων refers not merely to βροντῶν (feminine), but to all of the antecedents. We might expect λέγουσαν, agreeing with φωνήν; but this is not the usual method of John, comp. φωνὴν σάλπιγγος λεγούσης, 1: 10. 4: 1. Mere *prose* would attribute the speaking to the *voice;* poetic animation regards it as proceeding from the persons or things which utter loud sounds. Those who have overlooked this, have charged these last two passages with anomaly or barbarism. Anomaly it may be, in the eye of a mere technical grammarian; but can we be justly cramped by his narrow rules, in judging of the Apocalypse? What must we decide, on such ground, respecting many a passage in Homer, Pindar, Thucydides, and even Plato?

To the present category belongs the alleged anomalous use of *number*, in connection with NEUTER PLURALS. The allegation against the Apocalypse is, that 'it employs a *plural* verb in connection with these, while the Greek idiom demands a verb in the *singular*.'

But here we must remark, that the general rule thus laid down admits of many exceptions. When *animated* beings, which of course have distinct individualities of being, are designated, the *plural* verb is the more common usage after a neuter plural noun. So when *plurality of parts* is a predominating idea of the noun, and specially when a *numeral* qualifies it (which of course implies *distinct* parts), the plural

verb is often and even more usually employed after a neuter plural noun. But there is no entire uniformity in these cases; and exceptions may be found even in the best Greek authors, and specially in the later ones. Sometimes both usages appear in the same sentence. Has the Apocalypse violated these principles?

Facts will answer this question. As usual, the verb *singular* follows the neuter plural, in 2: 27. 8: 3. 9: 10, 20. 13: 14. 14: 13. 17: 8. 18: 14. 21: 12; all of which cases differ in no respect from the more common classical usage. In several instances, however, the verb singular stands connected with neuter plurals designating animated beings, viz. in Rev. 1: 5. 5: 13. 16: 14. 19: 14. But in each of these cases the singular number seems to be employed, because the idea expressed is rather designed to be *collective* than individualizing; in which case the more common usage would adopt the singular, in order merely to express *totality* rather than individuality. It is apparently on this ground, that the neuter plural, even when connected with a numeral, sometimes takes a verb in the singular, as e. g. in Rev. 20: 3, 5, 7, τελέσθη τὰ χίλια ἔτη, where the design of expressing totality is plain. On the contrary, the plural verb is usual in the Apocalypse, when *animated* beings are spoken of; e. g. 3: 4. 5: 6. 11: 13, 18. 15: 4. 16: 14. 18: 23. 21: 24. So virtually in 4: 6, 8. 5: 14. 19: 21. Even the minute shade of expressing *individuality*, is observable in the usage of the Apocalypse; e. g. Rev. 1: 19, ἃ εἰσι; 3: 2, ἃ ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν, i. e. particular Christian virtues; 8: 11, ἐπικράνθησαν, viz. various waters, see in verse 10; 15: 4, δικαιώματα ἐφανερώθησαν, viz. the seven last plagues, see verse 1; 20: 12, βιβλία ἠνοίχθησαν, the many books of record for all the human race; 21: 4, τὰ πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον, viz. the former various objects of heaven and earth. If there be in the Apocalypse any other plural verbs joined with neuter plurals, I can only say, they have escaped my diligent and often repeated investigation.

The result, in this case, is very different from what even recent critics of name, e. g. Ewald and others, have represented it to be. In fact, we are even surprised at the degree of conformity to the principles of classical usage. Some few cases there are, where the writer employs both the singular and plural verb in the same sentence; e. g. in 16: 14. 19: 14. But in this, too, there is no singularity; for we have the same in John 10: 4, 5, 27. 1 Cor. 10: 11. 2 Peter 3: 10. 1 Sam. 9: 12 (Sept.). Il. β, 135. Sometimes also the verb singular is employed, in other books of the New Testament, in case animated beings are spoken of, e. g. John 10: 4, 16. 1 John 3: 10. Luke 8: 2. Mark 14: 27; sometimes the plural, John 10: 4, 5, 8, 12, 16. See also, Matt. 12: 21. Mark 5: 13. James 2: 19. Whoever wishes to see all these usages confirmed by the Classics, may consult Winer, Gramm. § 47. 3. Kühner, § 424.

Nor is there any stable foundation for the remark, of late often repeated, that the Apocalypse differs palpably from the Gospels and Epistles of John, as to the usage in question. I have looked through these books, and found in both of them some thirty instances of the verb singular with a neuter plural, (and these are all that I have found by a minute search); but not more than some three or four of these designate animated beings, when the object is to individualize. In the Gospel and Epistles, John follows common usage, as explained above. In the Apocalypse, we find the same usages; and so the idiom is of the same nature in both. John in his Gospel, 10: 4, 5, 8, 12, 16, shows that the plural was familiar to him, when *animated* beings were spoken of. Any attempt to build on any discrepancy in usage, in regard to this particular, the theory of diversity of authorship between the Apocalypse and the books of John the apostle, is surely in vain. There is no marked peculiarity, in this respect, in either of these books. Prototypes in classic Greek, in all respects, may easily and everywhere be found.

(3) 'The syntax of the verb and participle,' it has often been alleged, 'is frequently violated in the Apocalypse.'

(*a*) 'The Present tense is put for the Praeter.' This is indeed very frequent; but then this belongs to all the New Testament, and to all the classic Greek writers. The *historic Present*, (as grammarians call it), belongs of course to all animated narration; and it is to be found unusually often, both in the Gospel of John and in the Apocalypse. In reading through both these books, I have noted one hundred cases in which it is employed in the Gospel, and forty cases in the Apocalypse. Of the one hundred, however, some sixty-five belong merely to the word λέγει, singular or plural; and a large portion of the others to ἔρχεται and some other common verbs of motion. The numerous cases of λέγει belong, almost entirely, to the frequent dialogues which the Gospel exhibits. In the Apocalypse, but few dialogistic passages occur; and in these there is just about the same frequency of λέγει as in the Gospel. As to other cases, I have noted thirty-five in the Gospel and thirty in the Apocalypse, which exhibit a similarity of usage in both that deserves special notice, inasmuch as they are some indication of the same hand in both. For the rest, I would merely remark, that although the *historic* Present is everywhere to be found in the New Testament, yet nowhere is it employed with so much frequency as in the writings of John. As the Hebrew has no appropriate form for the Present, this must be put to the account of the *Greek*, and not of the Hebrew idiom.

(*b*) 'The Present is used for the Future.'—It is so; yet not in any other manner than in other parts of the New Testament, excepting that, from the nature of the composition which is prophetic, either the *proxi-*

mate future, or the *certainty* that the things described will take place, naturally presents itself with greater frequency than in mere didactic composition. Nothing is more usual, than to employ the *Present* tense in order to express either of these ideas. Thus Matt. 26: 2, "Ye know that after two days *is* (γίνεται) the Passover, and the Son of Man *is betrayed* (παραδίδοται) in order to be crucified;" where the proximity and the certainty of the events are strongly marked by the Present tense. And so in cases more than can well be numbered. In a rhetorical view, this mode of expression is far more significant and intense than the simple Future. The thing to take place is designated as already happening or being accomplished. There is here no *enallage* of the tenses, as grammarians are wont to call it, i. e. the use of one tense for another by a sort of mistake or heedlessness; but there is a designed *tropical* use of the Present, in order to give vivacity and energy to the expression.*

In perfect accordance with this idiom are our English expressions: *I am going abroad; I am going to journey; I am coming to see you speedily*, and the like. In the Greek and Latin classics, the same idiom is altogether common; see Winer, Gramm. § 41. 2, for examples and references. Nor need we call it *Hebraism*, as Ewald does (Comm. p. 39), when such a tropical Present is followed by a Future, in the same construction. Virtually such a Present is a Future; and, of course, the regular Future may naturally follow in order. In most of these cases, moreover, the tropical Present designates only *preparatory* action, while the regular Future designates the action consequent upon this, and really future in respect to it. Such a use of tenses needs no apology and no defence. The Gospel of John presents us with the like phenomena; e. g. 14: 3, 18, 19, 30. 16: 16, 22, 25, al., in some of which cases the Future even *precedes* the tropical Present. All this shows how easy and familiar such a construction is.

(*c*) 'Anomalies in the use of the Future occur in the Apocalypse.'— There is but one passage, however, where anything special and peculiar in the use of the Future occurs. This is in Rev. 4: 9 seq., and runs thus: καὶ ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζῶα δόξαν . . . πεσοῦνται οἱ . . . πρεσβύτεροι . . . καὶ προσκυνήσουσι . . . καὶ βαλοῦσι, etc. Winer (Gramm. § 41. 6) refers these Futures to the subsequent scenes of the like nature described in the Apocalypse, e. g. 5: 8—14. 11: 16. 19: 4. But how could the

* In the Gospel of John such a use of the Present is very common; e. g. 7: 33. 8: 14 bis, 21, 35. 9: 4. 12: 35. 13: 3, 33, 36. 14: 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 19, 28 bis, 30. 16: 2, 16, 22, 25, 28, 32. 17: 11, 13. 21: 22, 23 bis, etc. These are only specimens. 1 John 2: 18. 4: 3 al. So in the Apocalypse; e. g. 1: 7. 2: 5, 16, 22. 3: 9, 11. 11: 5, 6, 9, 10, 14. 13: 10. 14: 11 bis, 13 bis. 16: 15. 17: 11, 12, 13. 22: 7, 12, 20. Here again is much uniformity of usage between the two writings. Almost all the cases in question belong to such verbs as ἔρχομαι and ὑπάγω.

reader of the former passage be supposed to know what scenes were to be presented in the sequel? Much better is a solution to be found here, on the ground of Hebrew idiom. The use of the Hebrew Future, in designating actions *habitually* or *often repeated*, is well known to every intelligent reader of that language. Thus Job, who made sacrifices continually for his sons, is spoken of as כֵּכָה יַעֲשֶׂה, *so doing habitually*, Job 1: 5. So 1 Sam. 1: 7, "Year after year יַעֲשֶׂה, *did he do it.*" Ewald has a large number of examples, Gramm. § 278, § 289, 1st edit. The usage is clear. In Rev. 4: 9 seq., we have a case of the same nature. The Apocalyptist is painting a scene as it constantly or habitually is, not merely what presents itself for the moment to his eye. This agrees entirely with the Hebrew usage. The Greeks, in such a case, would commonly use the Present in an aoristic sense, just as it is employed in universal propositions. So should we do in English. But John, who leans strongly to Hebraism, has here chosen the Future to express his meaning. Nor is this case entirely peculiar. In Rom. 3: 30, *δικαιώσει* designates the *established* method of forgiveness. In Luke 1: 37, *ἀδυνατήσει* marks what belongs to all times. Even in classic Greek, the Future is employed to designate *repetition*, but mostly in regard to time future only; see Kühner, § 446. 2. The cases where refined conversation employs it for the Present, in such words as *βουλήσομαι*, *ἐθελήσω*, and the like, (Kühner, § 446. 3), will not apply to Rev. 4: 9 seq.

(*d*) The charge, that 'the Apocalypse employs anomalously the *Aorist* for the Future,' is hardly to be made out from *ἐτελέσθη* in 10: 7. The writer means to say, that "when the last trumpet shall sound, the mystery of God *is already completed.*" No Future could express this with the same energy. It is not indeed an expression of regular technical grammar, but one which true rhetoric prompts. So in Rev. 15: 1, "Seven angels, having the seven last plagues, *ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς ἐτελέσθη ὁ θύμος τοῦ θεοῦ*," the idea plainly is, that they are called *last*, because, when completed, the wrath of God is also completed at the same time. The expression indicates the *certainty* and the *full completion* of the thing designated. Perhaps *ἐβασίλευσας* in 11: 17, belongs to the same category. Nor is this use of the Aorist strange. Homer, Plato, Euripides, Demosthenes, and others employ the Aorist, (and also the Perfect), to designate with intensity the certainty of future events. Kühner has given abundance of examples to illustrate this, § 443, 2. The Aorist is even more intensive than the Perfect for this purpose, inasmuch as it denotes *completed* action in distinction from *continuance*, which the Perfect more appropriately attaches to itself as an adsignification. Virtually do we find the same use of the Aorist in John 13: 31. 15: 6, 8. Whatever difficulties may have existed among critics, in times past,

with respect to such a usage, it would seem that there is now no more occasion for them.

(*e*) Some other peculiarities in regard to verbs deserve a brief mention. In Rev. 12: 7, occurs an unusual construction of the Infinitive: "Michael and his angels *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος*." Ewald solves this Infinitive, by comparing it to the Hebrew Infinitive when it is taken as a gerund; and so he renders it here "*pugnandum*, i. e. pugnare debebant." But such is not the shade of meaning here. It is the simple relation of what was seen in vision. Much more probable is the solution that refers to the Hebrew Infinitive with לְ prefixed, which (with or without הָיָה expressed) stands for a definite tense, i. e. for the Future with its various meanings, and which may therefore be rendered in the past, present, or future, *pro exigentia loci*. In Chaldee, also, such an Infinitive is common; as the book of Daniel shows. See ample illustration in Ges. Lehrgeb. § 211. But in Rev. 11: 7, the context will readily supply the verb *ἐγένετο* or *ἐγένοντο*; so that *ἐγένοντο τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* = the Hebrew חָרוּ לְהַלָּחֵם, a mode of expression by no means uncommon in this language. The form of expression in the Apocalypse is doubtless a singular one, in such a connection; but in a work of such a nature, are we not to look for some expressions of this kind? Do not Homer, and Pindar, and Thucydides, present constructions quite as singular?

For the rest, the Infinitive with *τοῦ* before it, excepting when *τοῦ* marks it as a *nomen verbale* in the Genitive, is a rare occurrence, either in John's Gospel or in the Apocalypse. I have searched in vain for a single instance, excepting Rev. 12: 7; but still there may be some that have escaped my notice. Winer produces not one, in his numerous examples of the Infinitive with *τοῦ* before it, Gramm. § 45, 4. This is another remarkable point of resemblance between the two books.

Instances I have noticed of a peculiar use of the Perfect, *εἴληφα*, in Rev. 5: 7. 8: 5, viz. as a simple Aorist. Perhaps there is another in 3: 3. It is well known, that a difference among the best Greek writers exists, in regard to the frequent use of the Perfect. Herodotus, for example, abounds in it; and among orators it is very common, inasmuch as the past is thereby represented as standing in connection with the time when they are speaking. It is exceedingly difficult to draw any exact line in this case, inasmuch as the use of it often depends on the mere subjective views of the writer or speaker. But in the instances before us, the *aoristic* sense is so plain and as it were necessary, that we can hardly bring *εἴληφε* within the bounds of common classical usage. In Rev. 2: 27. 11: 17, the writer shows that he understood the true and distinctive nature of this Perfect.

(*f*) In respect to PARTICIPLES, it is said that 'the Apocalypse em-

ploys them in an absolute way, i. e. in the simple sense of a verb having a finite tense; and this in a manner and measure nowhere else to be found.' And there seems, indeed, to be some good foundation for this remark. Instances of this nature may be found in Rev. 1: 16. 4: 5. 10: 2, 8. 14: 14. 19: 12, 13. 21: 12, 14, 19. Also 6: 2, 5 may be reckoned here, but this is not necessary; but 4: 1, 6. 5: 6. 7: 9, usually reckoned here, do not properly belong to this category, but have the usual attributive sense. In 16: 10, the participle has *ἐγένετο* with it, which, however, here means *became*, and is not the proper helping verb for the participle. The use of participles for verbs, when accompanied by the definite verbal forms of *εἶναι*, specially the use of them for the Imperfect, is common to all the New Testament, and usual in good Greek writers; Winer, § 46. 9. Kühner, § 416. 4. So in John's Gospel, 1: 28. 10: 40. 13: 23. 16: 24. 17: 23. 19: 11, 19. 20: 30; all of which, however, belong to the third person, singular and plural, of the *Perfect*, (which is common everywhere), excepting the first two. But in most or all of these cases, the copula *εἶναι* is *expressed;* whereas in the Apocalypse it is omitted. It must be conceded, therefore, that, in respect to this particular of participial usage, the Apocalypse differs from the other New Testament books in general. But if we resort to the Hebrew and Chaldee idiom we may easily find the prototype. In these, the participle is employed, times without number, for the definite tenses of the verb, and often stands in the same construction with a verb which follows it; Gesen. Lehrgeb. § 214. In Hebrew, also, the verb הָיָה (to be) may be employed with participles, as *εἶναι* is in Greek; but this construction is somewhat more rare. Hence we find the Apocalyptist employing the Greek participle in the usual Hebrew manner, i. e. omitting the copula or helping verb *εἶναι*. The deep Hebrew colouring of the book serves both to explain and to excuse this. And even the rapid transitions of thought, and the abrupt nature of the composition, may serve to account for the omission of *εἶναι*, where a more sedate condition of mind would perhaps have supplied it. Or it may be accounted for on the ground of rhetorical brachylogy. Examples of the like kind, where *εἶναι* is omitted, are not wanting in the Greek Classics; see Kühner, § 680.

Occasionally, moreover, we find in the Apocalypse a species of *anacoluthon* in the use of the participle; since it is followed by a finite verb in the same construction; e. g. Rev. 2: 20, "Jezebel, *ἡ λέγουσα* that she is a prophetess, *καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς ἐμοὺς δούλους*." See also 1: 5, 6, *τῷ ἀγαπῶντι . . . καὶ λούσαντι . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς*, etc.; 3: 7. 18: 17. But this *anomaly*, (if that which is common to Greek writers, and to all the New Testament, may be so called), is not more frequent in the Apocalypse than elsewhere. In Hebrew this is

far from being an unusual construction, Gesen. Lehrg. § 216. 2; and in the New Testament, it is almost everywhere to be found, Winer, § 64, II. 2, *b*. It is no stranger even in the Classics; see Winer ut supra.

(4) There are other specialities of idiom in the Apocalypse, by which it is somewhat distinguished from classic Greek. Yet very few of them are peculiar merely to this book; for they belong in general to the common Hebrew-Greek idiom of the New Testament. Thus, the *dual* number is nowhere found in the Apocalypse; but this is equally true of all the New Testament. Even in classic Greek it is often dispensed with, and particularly in the later Greek.

In classic Greek the Genitive of nouns, as well as of pronouns, is not unfrequently *prefixed* to the governing noun, for the sake of emphasis; but this is less frequent in the New Testament, and particularly in the Apocalypse. Perhaps the Hebrew idiom, (which always places the Genitive *after* a governing noun), may have had some influence on this usage. At all events, such a position of the Genitive before its governing noun is merely rhetorical.

In the Apocalypse there is, in several places, an unusual succession of Genitives following each other without any intervening words; e. g. 8: 13. 9: 9. 13: 8. 14: 8, 10. 16: 14. 19: 15. But there are instances of the same nature in Paul, and in some passages of his writings even more frequently than here; see 2 Cor. 4: 4. Eph. 1: 6. 4: 13, and many more examples of the same kind in Winer, § 30. 3. Note 1. At all events, the Apocalyptist found examples enough of the like kind in Hebrew; e. g. three Genitives in Job 12: 24. 20: 17. Gen. 47: 9. Is. 13: 4, al.; and sometimes even four, as in Is. 10: 12. 1 Chron. 9: 13. Many other examples may be found in Gesen. Lehrg. § 174. 3. Note 2. In heathen writers the like may also be found; although they rarely occur with the same frequency. In most of the cases in the Apocalypse, as also in Hebrew, one or more of such Genitives occupy the place and have the meaning of *adjectives;* which relieves, in some measure, the seeming want of facility in expression, and also accounts for the accumulation of so many words in the same case.

There is also a repetition, in the Apocalypse, of the same word in a protracted sentence, whether preposition, pronoun (in the place of a pronominal adjective), verb, or leading noun, which strikes one at first as peculiar. E. g. Rev. 16: 13, "*Out of the mouth* of the dragon, and *out of the mouth* of the beast, and *out of the mouth* of the false prophet." So Rev. 5: 6, ἐν μέσῳ; 6: 12, ἐγένετο; 8: 12, τὸ τρίτον; 12: 9, ἐβλήθη; 13: 15, εἰκὼν θηρίου; 17: 6, ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος; 18: 22, 23, ἐν σοὶ ἔτι; 19: 6, ὡς φωνήν; 19: 18, σάρκας (four times). The frequent repetition of the *verb*, however, is rather rare. Instances like ἐδόθη in 13: 7, 14, 15,

κατεκάη in 8: 7, and some few others, may be easily explained on the ground of rhetorical emphasis or intensity. In like manner the repetition of αὐτοῦ and αὐτῶν (in the room of pronominal adjectives) is not of much frequency. Examples of αυτοῦ may be found in 13: 2. 14: 9; of αὐτῶν, in 6: 11. 9: 19, 21 (four times). 11: 9. 13: 16. 14: 13. 16: 11. Other cases of apparent repetition belong not to this rubric, because they are attached to separate objects to which one common pronoun (adjective) could not properly be applied. The cases above designated stand on the basis of Hebrew usage, or at least of Old Testament rhetoric. The Hebrew says, and must say: בָּנָיו וּבִנֹּתָיו, *his sons and his daughters*, and not in the manner of οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ; in the like way the Apocalyptist expresses himself in the passages above. Yet the repetition of the pronoun in some of these cases is rather for the sake of *intensity*, than for any other purpose.

The repetition of the same *preposition* before different nouns in the same case and joined together, is more frequent in the Apocalypse than in classic Greek, and rather distinguishable, with respect to frequency, from the usual run of New Testament Greek; see ἐκ in 15: 2, 8. 16: 13. 17: 6; ἐνώπιον in 3: 5. 14: 3, 10; μετά in 19: 19; διά in 20: 4. But such cases as ἀπό in 1: 4, 5, εἰς in 1: 11, ἐν in 6: 8, and διά in 1: 9. 12: 11, are not to be reckoned here, because they serve the purpose of *specification* and *distinction;* see Winer, § 54. 7. Even in the Greek classics a similar usage prevails, and for the like purpose. The repetition of prepositions in *Hebrew*, occasionally to a great length, is by no means unfrequent; see 2 Sam. 1: 12. 2: 9. 3: 10. Hos. 1: 7. Is. 11: 11. Still, I apprehend that most, if not all, the cases in the Apocalypse were the effect of design on the part of the writer—a design to make each part *distinct*. A similar repetition may be found in all parts of the New Testament; and the usage itself depends mostly on the *subjective* views and feelings of the writer; see Winer, *ut supra*. The contrary practice, i. e. the *omission* of the preposition before nouns in the same case and connected, may be seen in 1: 9. 5: 9. 10: 11. 11: 9. 13: 7, al.

The allegation, that the Apocalypse more frequently inserts prepositions before cases that might dispense with them, than any other New Testament book, can hardly be established; at least not in such a measure as to render prominent this difference of construction. When we consider that the Hebrew has no Genitive and Dative cases after verbs, except as they are made by the help of *prepositions;* and also that a strong Hebrew idiom plainly pervades the Apocalypse, (as indeed we might naturally expect), there is nothing strange in the fact, that prepositions before these cases are more frequent than in the Classics, specially in the earlier ones. Yet examples may easily be found, and with some frequency, of a different tenor. E. g. the Dative of manner, means,

material, time, etc., without any preposition; as in 5: 1, 12. 6: 10. 7: 2, 10. 8: 3, 4, 8, 13. 10: 3. 14: 18. 15: 2, 8. 17: 4. 18: 10, 16 bis, 19, 21. 19: 17. 21: 8, 16, 19. 22: 14.

Examples moreover almost without number may be found, where the Dative is regularly employed after such verbs as signify to give, to impart, to call to, to show, manifest, tell, belong to, etc., which occur everywhere in the Apocalypse; and besides these, many examples of the Dative where other constructions might be employed, e. g. after *προσκυνέω* in 4: 10. 5: 14. 7: 11. 11: 16. 13: 4 bis. 16: 2. 19: 4, 10 bis, 20. 20: 4. 22: 9; *ἀκολουθέω*, 14: 4, 9. 19: 14; *λατρεύω*, 7: 15; *συγκοινωνέω*, 18: 4. For the rest, I have examined the whole book for the purpose of putting to the test the alleged lack of the Dative case in the Apocalypse; and I find it employed as often as elsewhere in the New Testament, where verbs are employed by the writer which admit of it. Cases occur here, as elsewhere, in which the writer had his choice between the Dative and Accusative, and in which he preferred the latter; a trait of style not peculiar to him only, but found in all parts of the New Testament, and in other Greek writings. In all this there is nothing peculiar.

In regard to the use of the Genitive case *after* verbs and participles, instances after the manner of the Classics are not wanting; e. g. *δώσω ... τοῦ μάννα*, 2: 17; *γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν*, 4: 6, 8, and the like in 5: 8. 15: 7. 21: 9; *ἐγεμίσθη καπνοῦ*, 15: 8; *γέμον βδελυγμάτων*, 17: 4; *ἤκουσα ἑνός*, 6: 1, and the like in 6: 3, 5. 14: 13. 16: 1, 5, 7. 21: 3. It is beyond a doubt, therefore, that the writer was acquainted with the classical use of this oblique case; and it would seem, that when he has not followed this use, he has either exercised a choice which was grammatically within his power, or else he leaned to the Hebrew mode of constructing a sentence. The use of prepositions naturally makes language more specific. Hence, throughout the New Testament, as also the later Greek authors, we find this use very common, even in a multitude of cases where the laws of grammar might dispense with it. That the writer of the Apocalypse was not ignorant of even the nicer uses of the Genitive, is plain from several constructions with which we meet; e. g. the Genitive of *price* or *value*, as *δηναρίου* twice in 6: 6; of *time when*, as *ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός*, 7: 15. 12: 10. 14: 14. 20: 10, an imitation of the Hebrew יוֹם וָלָיְלָה. Once we have the length of time designated by the Genitive, viz. *δέκα ἡμερῶν* in Rev. 2: 10. But instances of such a nature are not wanting in the Classics, and in other parts of the New Testament; see my New Testament Grammar, § 100. 7, comp. § 106. 4.

The cases in which the Hebrew construction of verbs with their following cases is preferred to the grammatical and ordinary Greek one, are almost none; and what there are according to some of the critics,

seem to be of doubtful authority. Thus in 2: 14, *ἐδίδασκε τῷ Βαλάκ*; where, however, Wetstein, Vater, and Tittmann, employ the normal *τόν*, and Mill reads *ἐν τῷ Βαλάκ*, i. e. in the history of Balak. But if we adopt the reading *τῷ Βαλάκ*, we have Hebrew usage of a similar nature; e. g. לִמֵּד לְ, Job 21: 22, הוֹרָה לְ, Deut. 33: 10. Hos. 10: 12 (bis); although the Hebrew, like the Greek, usually prefers the Accusative after these verbs. Besides, *τῷ Βαλάκ* may be here the *Dativus commodi*, which is not unfrequently recognized in the Apocalypse; for in Num. 22: 6 Balak says to Balaam: "*Ἀρασαί μοι, curse for me* this people, etc." Nor is the Dative of *instrument* here an impossible construction; for the meaning would then be, that Balaam employed Balak as his instrument in enticing the Israelites; which sacred history confirms.

In like manner *κρίνειν τὸ αἷμα ἐκ* or *ἀπό τίνος*, and *ἐκδικάζω . . . . ἔκ τινος*, 6: 10. 18: 20. 19: 2, is to be accounted for probably on the ground of the Hebrew נָקַם מִן or דָּרַשׁ מִן; see Ges. Lex. in vv. *Ἀκολουθεω μετά τινος*, 6: 8. 14: 13, need not be attributed to Hebraism; for even Lysias and Demosthenes express themselves occasionally in this way, not only after *ἀκολουθέω*, but after other kindred verbs; see Phrynicus, edit. Lobeck, p. 353 seq. Nor is there any necessity of referring *εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς*, in 11: 11, to the Hebrew בּוֹא בְּ, as Lücke does, p. 220. There is a nice, but still a well known, idiom of the Greek, which permits the Dative with *ἐν*, after *verbs of motion*, to be used in the same sense as the Accusative with *εἰς*, because there is in such a case in fact a *constructio praegnans;* so in John 5: 4. Luke 7: 17. Rom. 5: 5. Matt. 10: 16, al. This is also quite frequent in the Classics; see my N. Test. Grammar, § 113. Note 2. Kühner's Gramm. § 621. *a. b.* Winer, § 54. 4. The word omitted, in such cases, is some verb which signifies *to dwell, remain in, take one's station*, etc., and the mode of expression is of course brachylogical.

In a few cases a peculiar preposition follows certain verbs. E. g. Rev. 9: 20, 21. 16: 11, *μετανοεῖν ἐκ*, instead of the Accusative. So in Acts 8: 22 with *ἀπό* after this verb. Is not this an imitation of the Hebrew שׁוּב מִן?

Once we have such an expression as *νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου*. I regard this as brachylogy, and equivalent to *conquerors safe from the encounter with the beast* = *νικῶντας* [*καὶ σωζομένους*] *ἐκ*, etc. We meet with it but once.

The phrase *ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*, Rev. 21: 21, is, I believe, without any parallel in the New Testament or in the classics. As a preposition *ἀνά* governs the Accusative in prose, and usually the Dative in poetry. Here, however, it is employed before the Nominative, and seems therefore to be used *adverbially* in order to designate the idea of *distribution*, and to mean *severally* or *separately;* comp. Luke 9: 3. Rev. 4: 8, for a like shade of idea.

Some peculiar phraseology occurs in the Apocalypse, which belongs rather to the aesthetical than to the grammatical department. E. g. Rev. 8: 13, "I heard an eagle flying ... *saying* with a loud voice, etc." The meaning seems plainly to be: 'I heard an angel eagle-winged, or taking an eagle-flight, saying, etc.' The manner of expression is bold and abrupt, but not too much so for the Apocalypse. Again in 9: 1, "I saw a star falling from heaven ... and to *him* was given the key of the bottomless pit, etc."; i. e. I saw an angel star-like or resplendent as a star, etc. Rev. 16: 7, "I heard the altar, *saying:* Yea, Lord God, etc.," i. e. a voice from the altar, or from the altar-angel, viz., the angel who watched over the altar. These and the like expressions plainly belong to the vivid and abrupt style of the Apocalypse, and to the glowing imagery which pervades it. It is the *poet* on whom we are to criticise, in such cases, and not the technical rhetorician and grammarian.

A peculiar division of the universe occurs in 8: 7—12. 14: 7, and the like in 16: 2—8, viz. into heaven, earth, the sea, and fountains of water. In the first and last cases, this is necessary to the writer, in order to carry his plan into execution of dividing the trumpets and the vials into classes of four and three; and the passage in 14: 7 follows the same analogy. The departure from the usual Hebrew division of heaven and earth, or heaven and earth and seas, seems to be wholly occasioned by the plan of the writer in arranging the subordinate parts of his work.

Like the Hebrews generally, the Apocalyptist often employs the *Nominative absolute;* e. g. 2: 26. 3: 12, 21. 6: 8. 7: 13. 17: 16. So in Gospel 1: 12, 18, 27, 33. 3: 32. 8: 45. 15: 2. Epistle, 2: 27. 3: 17. The Nominative followed by οὗτος as subject of the verb, 3: 5. 17: 11, is of a similar tenor. But both of these are common in all Hebrew-Greek; nor are they, particularly the first of them, strangers to the Classics. See my Heb. Grammar, §§ 415—417. N. Test. Grammar, § 97. 2. The Nominative *form* with a vocative *meaning*, as in 6: 10. 15: 3. 16: 7, al., is common not only to the New Testament, but even to the Classics, as any good grammar will show; Matthiae, § 612. Bernhardy, p. 67.

The *repetition* of a demonstrative pronoun, specially in relative clauses of a sentence, is not unusual in the Apocalypse; e. g. 7: 2, οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι etc.; 20: 8, ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς ἡ ἄμμος etc. Even adverbs are sometimes repeated in like manner; as 12: 6, ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον etc.; 12: 14, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ etc. Other instances of the former kind, see in 3: 8. 6: 4, 8. 7: 9. 17: 9. But in this there is nothing peculiar to the Apocalypse, unless perhaps its frequency. Examples may be found in all parts of the New Testament; in the Septuagint the usage is still more frequent, because its idiom is still more Hebraistic. But even the Classics are not strangers to the same verbosity,

(if it must be so named); and such writers as Xenophon and Cicero have deemed it proper on some occasions to employ it. Proofs abundant of all this may be seen in Winer's Grammar, § 22. 4. The *frequency* of it in the Apocalypse may be regarded as Hebraistic. Every Hebrew scholar must call to mind the well known idiom of אֲשֶׁר, as in לוֹ . . . אֲשֶׁר *to whom*, שָׁם . . . אֲשֶׁר *where*, etc., (see Ges. Lehrgeb. § 197); and also the pleonastic suffix-pronoun which is followed by the noun to which it relates, as וַתִּרְאֵהוּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד, *she saw him—the child*, Ex. 2: 6, Ges. ubi sup. § 192. 2 seq. Like to this are the repetitions in question. In the Apocalypse we can hardly put them to the account of *intensity*, although they would seem to be appropriate for such a purpose, like our English *that-there*, etc. But *particularity of specification* must at least be allowed to them.

Similar to this usage is another, which repeats the *demonstrative* pronouns after the subject or Nominative case has been already mentioned, and inserts a pronoun relating to this same subject before the verb to which that Nominative properly belongs; and so with the other cases; e. g. Matt. 24: 13, *ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.* Matt. 6: 4. Mark 7: 15, al. saepe. So in Rev. 6: 4, *τῷ καθημένῳ . . . ἐδόθη αὐτῷ λαβεῖν* etc. 3: 5. 2: 17. But this usage is also to be found in the Classics, (see Winer, § 23. 3); and the repetition in all such cases is made for the sake of intensity or emphatic specification. See examples in Xen. Conv. 8. 33. Ages. 4. 4.

It has been alleged, that the Apocalypse employs the Accusative of *time* contrary to good usage, i. e. that it employs the Accusative to designate *time when*, and not merely *duration* of time. For proof of this it is common to quote Rev. 3: 3, *οὐ μὴ γνῶς ποίαν ὥραν ἥξω*, etc. But this is the only instance of this kind in the whole book. The common usage, i. e. to designate *duration* of time, may be seen in 8: 1. 11: 2, 3, 6, 9. 12: 6, 14. 13: 5. 17: 10, 12. 20: 2, 4, 6. Moreover, cases like that in Rev. 3: 3 may be found in the Classics; see Kühner, § 545. Anm. 4. That time which is at the *ultimate extent* of his coming, is here the prominent idea, and therefore the Accusative is allowable. So in the Classics, we find *νύκτα, τὴν ἑσπέραν, τὸν ὄρθρον*, etc., in a sense like that which the Genitive would have; see Bernhardy, Synt. p. 116. See, for the regular use of the Genitive in designating time, what is said above, p. 245 seq.

A peculiar construction is found in the present text of Rev. 2: 13, viz. *ἐν ἡμέραις ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας, ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός, ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη παρ' ὑμῶν.* It is impossible to make out a grammatical construction from this as it now stands. It would seem that either *ἐν αἷς* must be omitted and *Ἀντίπας* be written *Ἀντίπα* in the Genitive, or else *ὅς* must be dropped. That *ὅς* has arisen from a duplication of the end-

syllable of the preceding word, *πιστός*, would seem altogether probable; more particularly so, as nothing like such a construction occurs any where else in the Apocalypse. To read, as Lachmann does, *Αντίπας*, and omit *ἐν αἷς* before it, seems to make an absurd text. No writer in possession of his senses could have written so. See Commentary on the passage.

The manner in which two nouns are joined together by *ὡς*, *as, in like manner as, as it were*, etc., deserves a passing notice. In general the noun after *ὡς* has the same case as the one before it; e. g. 1: 17, *ἔπεσα . . . ὡς νεκρός*. 6: 12, *ὁ ἥλιος . . . μέλας ὡς σάκκος*. 3: 3. 6: 11, 14. 9: 2. 10: 1, etc. So in the Accusative, as 2: 18, *ὀφθαλμοὺς . . . ὡς φλόγα πυρός*. 2: 27. 9: 8, *εἶχον τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν*. 9: 9. 12: 15. 14: 2. 18: 21, al. But in 6: 1, we have: . . . *λέγοντος, ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς*, i. e. *ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς λέγει*. But examples of elliptical construction with *ὡς* are everywhere to be found, and in a great variety of cases; see Lex. *ὡς*. The Hebrew, moreover, forms a separate under sentence by words connected with the כְּ of mere similitude; for, in such cases, brachylogy is usual. There seems to be no special peculiarity in the Apocalypse in regard to *ὡς*, when employed as above described.

After such an extended examination of those constructions in the Apocalypse, which have been erroneously put by many to the account of barbarism, solecism, or peculiarity of style, we may now come to *a few particulars, in which the style of this book, or the manner of its diction, differs from most, or all, of the other New Testament books.*

This difference is limited principally to the *conjunctive* particles. Throughout the Apocalypse, we find scarcely anything but *καί* as a *conjunctive*, or even a *transitive*, particle. The *δέ* and *οὖν* and *τέ* and *γάρ* of other New Testament books are scarcely to be found here. *Οὖν* we meet with only in the introduction or monitory part, viz. in 1: 19. 2: 5, 16. 3: 3. 3: 19, in all of which cases it is *illative*. In the same part, also, we find *δέ*, transitive in 1: 14, and so in 14: 13. 19: 12; but disjunctive in 2: 5, 16, 24. 10: 2. 21: 8; not to be found elsewhere, (if I have not overlooked it), excepting *δέ* in combination with other words, such as *οὐδέ*, etc. We might naturally expect *δέ* in such transitions as exist in 2: 8, 12, 18. 3: 1, 7, 14. 12: 7. 14: 8, 9, 13, 14. 16: 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 17, etc.; yet *καί* is employed in all these cases. Not only so, but *καί* is employed in a great portion of the transitions even of the largest kind, where a classic writer could hardly be expected to use it, and where it is not very common in other New Testament books; e. g. in 6: 1. 7: 1. 8: 1. 10: 1. 11: 1, 15. 12: 1. 13: 11. 14: 1, 6. 15: 1. 16: 1. 17: 1. 18: 1. 20: 1, 4. 21: 6. Even in John's Gospel and Epistles such cases are not wanting; e. g. 1: 19. 2: 1. 4: 27, 46. 7: 1. 9: 1. Ep. 1: 5. 2: 20. 4: 21. In all this the Hebrew scholar will see a strong tinc-

ture of *Hebraism*. Almost the only particle which connects sentences larger or smaller in Hebrew, or clauses of sentences, is *Vav*, ו. This particle is not only employed to connect different words used in the same construction, but in attaching clauses or words used in the way of Hendiadys, or as epexegetical and explicative, or in the way of apodosis, or between the members of a comparison; moreover, also, between parts of sentences, or whole sentences, adversative, antithetic, or disjunctive; and so also Vav introduces causal clauses, or conclusive ones (וְ = *therefore*), or final or consecutive ones (showing the end or object). See Ges. Lex. on ו for examples of all these uses. It is not only employed in all this variety of ways, but it often stands even at the beginning of a new book, in the Old Testament; see Ex. 1: 1. Lev. 1: 1. Josh. 1: 1. Judg. 1: 1. 1 Sam. 1: 1. 2 Sam. 1: 1. 1 K. 1: 1. 2 K. 1: 1. Ezek. 1: 1. Ruth 1: 1. Est. 1: 1. Ezra 1: 1. 2 Chron. 1: 1. In such cases, we can translate ו only by merging it in the verb, when it is prefixed to one, and regarding it as merely *conversive;* or when it stands before nouns or pronouns, as in Ex. 1: 1. 1 K. 1: 1. Ezra 1: 1, we are obliged to suppose, that it is designed to indicate a connection with some other book, which is regarded by the writer as properly preceding it; or else that it has been supplied as a mere *connective* with other books, by the redactor of the Old Testament Scriptures. The reader, who is familiar with the Old Testament and specially with the Prophets, needs not to be told, that other connectives of discourse, besides *Vav*, are there but very sparingly employed. And similar to this is the usage in the Apocalypse.

Τέ is not to be found (in the corrected text); but this particle is employed only twice by Matthew; not at all by Mark; only once by John in his Gospel and Epistles, almost never by Paul except in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and never by Peter. Luke is the only writer who is familiar with its use; and he employs it more than one hundred and twenty times in the book of Acts. To a native Hebrew, who used almost nothing but his ו as a connective, τέ must have appeared in some good measure as superfluous. The very unfrequent use of it in the New Testament, is a pledge for the truth of this statement.

As to γάρ, it occurs in the Apocalypse some fifteen times, and mostly in the simple *causal* sense. That it appears so seldom, is not in the least strange; for the Apocalypse is not a book of *ratiocination*, where the connection between a fact or truth and its cause or ground, is often to be expressed. Paul employs γάρ more than all the New Testament writers besides, because his epistles are so often argumentative. It is clear, however, that the use of γάρ was familiar to the writer of the Apocalypse; that it is employed so seldom, results merely from the kind of composition, which is a constant succession of descriptions of

things seen in vision, and arranged in such a way that *γάρ* is seldom needed or even admissible. In the Gospel it occurs some sixty-three times; but here ratiocination is very frequent.

That, in respect to the use of *δέ* and *οὖν* as particles of division and transition, the Apocalypse differs strikingly from the Gospel of John, must be confessed. *Οὖν* appears about 200 times in the Gospel; yet only once, however, in the first Epistle of John. *Δέ* also appears a great number of times in the Gospel; comparatively but seldom in the first Epistle; in the Apocalypse, thrice as a *continuative*, 1: 14. 14: 13. 19: 12, and five times as a *disjunctive*, 2: 5, 16, 24. 10: 2. 21: 8. The complexion of the Apocalypse is indeed altogether Hebraistic, in respect to *connectives*, for *καί* is almost the only one employed; and this falls in naturally with the fact, that this book was written soon after John went to Asia, while the Gospel was a later production.

As to those particles which belong peculiarly to ratiocinative discourse, and are employed to designate *logical* dependence and connection, it is of course perfectly natural, from the nature of the Apocalypse, that we should seldom find them in it; and equally natural that we should find them frequently in John's Gospel, a great part of which, as has been stated, consists of argumentation in some form against the notions of the Jews, or demonstration of the true principles of Christianity. Hence *ἐπεί, ἄρα, ἄρα οὖν*, and the like, are not to be found at all in the Apocalypse. *Ἐπεί* occurs, however, but twice in the Gospel of John, and not once in his epistles; and the other two particles not at all.

In fact, the structure of the sentences throughout the Apocalypse, with scarcely any exception, is almost entirely of the same simple nature as that which prevails in Hebrew. In this respect, the form of the book is altogether like that of the Hebrew prophets. As a singular exception to this remark may be mentioned Rev. 18: 11—13, where the sentence is not only complex in its form, but it also varies its construction in a sudden and almost surprising manner. Yet why should this be strange, in such an *ἐπινίκιον* as that chapter contains?

It is proper to remark, before we take leave of the subject respecting the manner in which sentences are joined together, connected, and continued, that a great number of them are introduced by *ἰδού*; about one half of these with an accompanying *καί*, and the other half without it. This is beyond all doubt a *Hebraism;* and no one, who is acquainted with Hebrew, can fail to have remarked the universal predominance of הִנֵּה (= *ἰδού*) in the Old Testament, specially in the prophecies. But although, in a book like the Apocalypse, we should very naturally expect the attention of the reader to be often called upon by the use of *ἰδού*, yet it is also common elsewhere; for John has employed it some five or six times in his Gospel, and Luke and Matthew times almost

without number. Paul uses it less frequently, as we should expect from the tenor of his epistles; and John does not exhibit it in his. It belongs, however, to Hebrew-Greek; and the use of it can never seem strange to a Hebrew reader.

Another equivalent method of calling attention, very often employed in the Apocalypse, is *καὶ εἶδον*. Nothing can be more natural than this, since the whole book is a succession of visions. A frequent particle in the Apocalypse, moreover, is *ὅτε*; which is in like manner a favourite particle in John's Gospel, in clauses where a transition of the discourse is made. *Μετὰ ταῦτα* in the same Gospel, and in the Apocalypse also, is another and frequent formula of transition; see Rev. 4: 1. 7: 1, 9. 15: 5. 18: 1. 19: 1. 20: 3.

I have now brought before the reader, all that is usually alleged as *peculiarity*, either as to diction or grammar, in the Apocalypse. We have found, after a protracted examination, that very little indeed, if anything, deserves the name either of *barbarism* or *solecism*. Nearly all that is apparently irregular or unusual, we may vindicate by references to classical or to Hebrew-Greek usage. It is only the *greater* frequency of these things in the Apocalypse, to which any appeal can be made for establishing the charge of *peculiarity* in this book. But this charge may be satisfactorily rebutted, by asking the questions: Is not the Apocalypse the production of an excited state of mind, and of the most vivid feeling? Is it not *prophetic poetry?*

Grammarians and rhetoricians do not think it meet to find fault with the Boeotian or Pindaric Schema in Doric writers. They allow Homer, Hesiod, and other poets, to take a thousand liberties also with the customary *forms* of words, and in many respects even with the rules of syntax; and all this without supposing it to be any good evidence of barbarism or solecism. Thucydides was no *barbarian;* and yet he has sinned against the ordinary technical rules of grammar, times almost without number. Who ventures to rebuke him, or to call him by hard names? Yet the Apocalyptist has not found a like indulgence among the critics. Eichhorn, for example, and Heinrichs, very kindly set John right, where they suppose him to have gone wrong, and supply (sometimes, but not always with success) the regular normal Greek, for the benefit of the hesitating reader. With the like kindness, apologies are frequently made, by them and others, for much of John's phraseology, which results, as they imagine, from his want of skill in Greek, or his overweening attachment to Hebraism, or his Rabbinical notions in various respects, and the like. All this, if you please, may be well intended; but I am fully persuaded that it is quite unnecessary. The more extensive any one's knowledge of Greek idiom is, and specially of

the Hebrew-Greek, the less difficulty will he find with the diction and syntax of the Apocalypse.

If John, the apostle, was the author of this book, an entire novice in Greek he probably was not when he wrote it, nor even when he went to Asia. It is more than probable, that the fishermen of the sea of Galilee were acquainted, at least in some good measure, with common *colloquial* Greek. The intercourse between that part of the country and their heathen neighbours, many of whom were Greeks, must have been very considerable. The very occupation of John must have early brought him in contact with many of these; and more or less of colloquial Greek would naturally be learned. That it would be strongly tinctured with the Hebrew idiom, there can be no rational doubt. The idea, that John was unable to read a Greek book of an ordinary character, can scarcely be rendered probable, even at the period when he first became a disciple of Christ. Much less so afterwards. He was surely no ordinary person; for the manner in which Jesus loved him, confided in him, and distinguished him from the other disciples, is proof of high intelligence as well as of moral worth. All this would go to show, that John was not a mere tyro in Greek, when he wrote the Apocalypse.

Besides; in the great mass of cases, the *tenses* of the Greek verbs are used in strict accordance with the nicer doctrines of the Greek tense. When departures from this take place, a good reason for them can be given; so that these departures even show a knowledge of the nicer tropical use of the tenses. The *modes* are employed in an appropriate manner. The Subjunctive regularly follows ἵνα, (a rule which Paul, no novice in Greek, does not always follow, see Gal. 4: 17. 1 Cor. 4: 6); and so is it also with ὅταν, etc. If a *Future* tense is ever employed in such cases, it is only where usage sanctions it. The *historic* Present is, as we have seen, quite frequent in the Apocalypse, and is there, as elsewhere, employed in order to promote the vivacity of the representation. We have seen above (p. 246), that the nicer uses of the Genitive and Dative were by no means unknown to the writer. Atticism in the use of the conjugate noun and verb, such as ἐκαυματίσθησαν . . . καῦμα, 16: 9, ἐθαύμασα . . . θαῦμα, 17: 6, John was cognisant of; or, perhaps, we may attribute this to Hebraism. So the Attic augment ᾐ, in ᾐδύνατο, 5: 3. 7: 9. 14: 3. 15: 8; the use of ἕστηκα as a Present tense, 3: 20, al. saepe; even the form ἑστήκεσαν, third plural of Pluperfect, not usual in the New Testament, is employed in 7: 11, and in the sense of an Imperfect, according to good Greek usage. No want of skill, indeed, in the forms or the tenses of Greek verbs, can be fairly charged upon the Apocalypse. Compound verbs are employed, as well as simple ones; and a fair proportion of them (as will be shown here-

after), and with the usual meaning, and the usual construction after them.

Moreover, there are peculiarities of Hebrew-Greek in general, which are often exhibited here. Thus we find the use of ἵνα with the Subjunctive, instead of the Infinitive mode; an idiom so common in John's Gospel, and not unfrequent elsewhere; Rev. 2: 21. 3: 9. 6: 4, al. Ἀπό is employed before nouns of measure, i. e. distance, Rev. 14: 20, ἀπὸ σταδιών, etc., in like manner as in John 11: 18. 21: 8, and also in the later Greek classics. The somewhat unfrequent use, indeed, of cases without prepositions, is obvious here; but so it is in all parts of the New Testament. Modes of expression like *time, times, and half a time*, 12: 14; *day* and *night* for the idea of *continually*, and the like idioms of the Hebrew, we also find.

In the use of οὐ and μή, in the use of οὐδέ . . . οὐδέ, οὔτε . . . οὔτε; in the meanings and regimen assigned to prepositions, and generally in the use of the particles so far as they are employed; there is nothing striking on the score of singularity in the Apocalypse. The compass of the writer's knowledge, which enabled him to distinguish and appropriately name all the precious stones which are adverted to in Rev. xxi, must have been considerable. He appears to have been at no loss for language to express his ideas. While an absolute and almost perfect simplicity in the construction of sentences predominates everywhere in his book, the writer still shows that he was capable of exhibiting a different arrangement; see Rev. 18: 11—13.

I am aware that the first impression of most readers is, that the Apocalypse differs widely from all the other books of the New Testament, those of John not excepted. In some respects this impression is correct. It is true, that in no other book do we find ourselves in the midst of scenes like those presented here. But are we not bound, as fair and candid investigators, to ask such questions as these: What other book of the New Testament is one continuous series of prophecy? What other book is throughout substantially and essentially a book of poetry? What other book, from beginning to end, is filled with symbols? What book even of the Old Testament will compare with the Apocalypse in this respect? What other book in the New Testament discloses continuous scenes of such a nature throughout, as the Apocalypse opens to our view? The germ of one part of the Apocalypse (v—xi.) we may find, indeed, in Matt. xxiv, and in the corresponding parts of Mark and Luke; but even there, we find the Saviour also employing tropes and symbols in a degree quite unusual. The plan of the Apocalypse makes one continuous series of symbols necessary in order to accomplish the writer's object. Shall we wonder, then, that he employs them? The scenes, moreover, to which he introduces us, even at

the very outset, imply of necessity that he is going to tread upon preternatural or supernatural ground. Some of his images are quite novel; at all events, the costume and the circumstances are novel. He is no mere imitator anywhere. When he presents scenes, the prototypes of which may be found in the Old Testament, he arrays them in his own peculiar drapery, and places them in positions which satisfy his own judgment and promote his own design. What wonder then, since he is traversing a supernatural world, that he presents us with objects new, strange, and different from any within the domain of other writings in the New Testament? The Apocalypse, designed for such an object as it is, would be but a tame and spiritless book, were not this the case. The vigour and activity of John's imagination lead him of course to present us with glowing pictures. *Oriental* taste discloses itself in these. The locusts and the horsemen, for example, in chap. ix, are altogether of an oriental cast. They bear the stamp of oriental excitement and vivacity, and (I may add) of oriental taste for the marvellous. But why should we allow to Arabian and Persian poets liberties to roam in the wide and almost boundless field of imagination, and deny to John a privilege granted freely to others?

Put now all these considerations together, and then ask: Whether the apparent novelty of the apocalyptic style is not to be ascribed mostly to the circumstances that have been mentioned? Is it not reasonable to expect such a kind of book as the Apocalypse, from a highly imaginative oriental man, himself a Hebrew, and having all the Hebrew prophetic models before him? The seeming strangeness or peculiarity of the Apocalypse is the result of comparing other New Testament books with it, and of not comparing the Old Testament prophecies, and the oriental taste in matters of this nature. I do not wonder, indeed, at the impression which most readers receive, in slightly studying the Apocalypse; but I do wonder, that critics and commentators have not given more attention to the nature and circumstances of this book, and have not furnished us with a better account of its imagery and its symbols.

In a *supernatural* world, all—all—must be in a certain sense new. Why should it be counted *strange*, that the writer has recognized this, and made his actors and his scenes to comport with the world in which they are found? Could a man of talents and vivid imagination, and (I may add) of genuine oriental taste, do otherwise in executing his plan than John has done?

I cannot resist the feeling that many of the objections which have been made against the Apocalypse as a work of John the Evangelist, have arisen from overlooking considerations of such a nature as those now suggested. A writer moving in a supernatural world—or in a re-

gion of trope and symbol and visions—is in a condition exceedingly different from that of the grave and simple historian, or of the didactic reasoner and preacher. Let us really allow this now in its full latitude, and we shall no longer be at a loss to account for the peculiar characteristics of the language of the Apocalypse.

§ 16. *Place and Time of writing the Apocalypse.*

The first of these inquiries is not of any serious importance, in respect to the book which is the object of our present investigation. Whether the Apocalypse was written at Patmos, at Ephesus, or at any other particular place, is a question which when settled does not alter its object or its contents; and consequently it cannot be of essential importance to any hermeneutical inquiries into the meaning of this prophecy. Still, it belongs to the *literature* of the book to say something upon this topic; and I must therefore briefly touch upon it.

1. The Place.

The writer of the Apocalypse would seem to have settled the question in regard to the *place* where the apocalyptic visions were seen, by his own declaration. *I John*, says he, *your brother and companion in affliction, . . . was in the isle called Patmos, on account of the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ*, 1: 9. However strange it may seem, yet critics of great name have understood this declaration as only a poetical fiction. Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the New Testament (1810), says: "The banishment of John to Patmos must be a mere matter of imagination; for otherwise, the author, by mingling historical and unhistorical [i. e. unreal] circumstances, has presented us with a hermaphrodite fiction, which no critical taste can justify. And a matter of fiction it may be; for real history nowhere says, that John was banished to Patmos; and what ecclesiastical tradition says respecting this, has no other source than the Apocalypse interpreted in an unpoetical manner, which has substituted fact in the place of fiction;" Einleit. II. 367.

Yet this same writer, in his commentary on the Apocalypse published in 1791, says: "That you should entertain doubts [respecting the actual exile of John in Patmos], the testimony of Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, forbids; unless you utterly abandon all credence in those who are not our contemporaries, however probable the things may be which they declare, and however constantly asserted by the tradition of subsequent times. But this, [he very justly adds], would be *to give up all faith in ancient history;*" Comm. p. 31 seq. Which of these representations by Eichhorn best comports with sound crit-

icism, may be left, I venture to say, to the judgment of every impartial man, who has any good degree of information and skill in matters of higher criticism.

But aside from this; what more reason is there to doubt that John was in Patmos, when he saw the visions described in the Apocalypse, than there is to doubt that Ezekiel was by the river Chebar, when he saw the vision related in the first chapter of his work? Or that Daniel was in Shushan, in the palace, in the province of Elam (Dan. 8: 2), when he saw the vision of the ram and the he-goat? Does any one doubt, that what Hesiod says of his birth-place and emigration to Boeotia, in his poem entitled *Works and Days*, is fact? l. 630—638. Or that what Ovid says of his banishment to Tomi; or what Phaedrus says of himself, in his Fables; or Martial, in his Epigrams; or Horace, in his Epistles; is *matter of fact?* And is there any better reason for regarding what John says of his being in Patmos, during his apocalyptic vision, as fiction and not as fact?

If Patmos be merely a fictitious place, why should John select it? Why did he not rather choose Sinai, or Carmel, or Hermon, or the Mount of Transfiguration where he had before seen Moses and Elijah from the heavenly world conversing with Jesus? These were consecrated spots, as one would naturally suppose, and therefore they would most readily occur to his mind, as appropriate places for a revelation. Why choose a *Grecian* islet, not once named elsewhere in all the sacred books, and scarcely twice or thrice by all the ancient writers of the heathen world?

'But' says Eichhorn, 'banishment was the penalty for making proselytes to the Christian religion, in those times; and Patmos was a very appropriate place for exile. John, therefore, imagines that had been done to him, which was so commonly done to Christians who were his contemporaries; and thus he places himself in the most complete solitude, a condition most of all appropriate to such visions as the Apocalypse relates;' Einleit. § 190.

But could not John place himself as much in solitude upon Sinai, or Carmel where Elijah saw the visions of God, or upon the Mount of Transfiguration? What is this, but an unsatisfactory reason for a fanciful theory?

There is another circumstance which confirms the impression, that Patmos was the real, and not a fictitious, place of the apocalyptic visions. The writer says, first of all, that he was 'a brother of those whom he addressed, and a *companion* (συγκοινωνός, participator) *in the affliction and kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ;*' thus intimating, that when he writes, his condition was one of suffering, like to that of the persons whom he addressed. Not only so, but he intimates that he

has been placed in such circumstances *by reason of*, or *on account of, the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ*, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1: 9. He not only gives his readers, then, a view of his own distressed condition, but he tells them *why* he had been brought into it, viz. 'on account of his adherence to and promulgation of the Gospel.' So we must understand and translate this passage; for in 6: 9, the writer speaks of the slain, lying at the foot of the altar in heaven, as slaughtered διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον, i. e. because of their steadfast adherence to the word of God as exhibited in the Gospel; and in 20: 4, he speaks again of the martyrs who had been slain διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. These passages show at the same time the idiom of the Apocalypse, and the true meaning of the writer when he employs such phraseology. In these two passages, he can mean only and merely, that the martyrdom referred to, in both cases, was occasioned by previous adherence to the Christian faith and perseverance in defending and propagating it. In like manner, John was ἐν θλίψει at Patmos, because he had pursued the like course. And this view of the subject, the common and classical use of διά serves to confirm. Διά with the Accusative is not employed to designate *future* purpose or object in view, but stands before nouns which indicate *past* causes or grounds why anything is, or is done. It marks the relation of reason or cause on account of which anything is, or is done, as one already extant, and not that of purpose, object, or end, yet to be pursued. Clearly and certainly, then, in 1: 9 it is employed in such a way and for such a purpose. Now if we assume, that the presence of the writer at Patmos is only *ideal*, according to Eichhorn and others, then we must bring out the following sentiment: 'I was in a spiritual ecstasy, and so imagined myself as being at Patmos, because I had persevered in defending and propagating the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ;' and moreover: 'I was ἐν θλίψει, because of a merely *ideal* transfer thither.' Does John, or would any man of sense, write thus?

Lücke (Stud. und Krit. IX. p. 600) has given another turn to 1: 9, viz. 'John was transported to Patmos, in order that he might receive the Revelation there, or be made the subject of apocalyptic visions there.' Why this was necessary, or specially useful, to John as the subject of divine communications, he does not tell us. But he feels that διά before the Accusative stands somewhat in the way of such an exegesis, inasmuch as it purports that John went, or was sent, to Patmos on account of some cause or ground *antecedently* existing, and not merely for the accomplishment of some end yet future. Yet he says even this difficulty may be removed; and he appeals to διά in Rom. 4: 25 and Phil. 2: 30, as marking the relation of a *future* end to be accomplished.

But in this appeal he cannot be sustained. In Rom. 4: 25, Paul says of Christ: "Who died *διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν*, and rose *διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν*." As mere facts or actual *occurrences*, both the offences and the justification were indeed future at the time of Christ's death; but as *motives* or *grounds*, or in other words as things already regarded as certain in the counsels of God, and now about to take place, they were fully in the mind of Christ before his death and resurrection. They were the moving causes of his sufferings. In Phil. 2: 30, there is still less ground to sustain the appeal. Paul says of Epaphroditus: "*διὰ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισε, on account of the work of Christ he drew near to death*;" which, by the aid of the clause *παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ* (this immediately follows), we may well explain as meaning, that the work of Christ which he had before performed, brought Epaphroditus into the danger in question. Nor is there any passage in the New Testament, that I have found, which will fairly sustain the sense here given by Lücke to *διά*; nor will he find any instance of such a nature allowed either by Winer in Gramm. § 53. c. *διά*, or by Kühner in Gramm. § 605. II. *διά*. Besides this philological difficulty, one might well ask: Why should John speak of himself as *ἐν θλίψει* and *συγκοινωνός* with others, in reference to his being sent to Patmos in order to receive a revelation there? Everything in the whole passage is unnatural, when it is viewed in such a light; and neither grammar nor congruity allows us so to explain it.

That John, then, was at Patmos, and was there as an exile, when he saw the apocalyptic visions, there remains no good reason to doubt. And so the united voice of antiquity declares. Whether this union of the ancient fathers depends on any other testimony, except what John himself has given in 1: 9, we do not and cannot know, unless some new evidence respecting this matter should hereafter be presented. Enough, if it has been shown what the proper meaning of John's words is.

The opinion advanced by some critics, that *διὰ τὸν λόγον θεοῦ*, etc. implies that John went to Patmos for the sake of preaching the Gospel, is liable to two objections, viz. first that *διά* cannot be so applied to a *future* object or purpose; secondly, that a little rocky islet, with scarcely any inhabitants, and almost entirely a desert, was not a probable place of resort for a missionary, while millions around him in Asia Minor were yet heathen. The supposition scarcely merits serious notice.

But another question has been connected with the *place of vision*, viz. that which respects the place of the *actual composition* or the writing out of the Apocalypse. In general the earlier Christian fathers do not speak definitely in respect to this. Eusebius, in his Chronicon on the 14th year of Domitian's reign, says of John: *Εἰς Πάτμον ἐξορίζεται· ἔνθα τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑώρακεν, ὡς δηλοῖ Εἰρηναῖος*. Both Ire-

naeus and Eusebius, then, speak only in general terms, viz. they speak only of John as having seen the visions at Patmos. In another passage of Eusebius, (Ecc. Hist. III. 28), he speaks of John's banishment, and also quotes from Irenaeus a passage which applies the verb ἑωράθη (*seeing* the visions) only to the author of the Apocalypse. Origen, appealing to Rev. 1: 9, says of John: Ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρακέναι, *he seems to have seen the Apocalypse in the island* [of Patmos]. Victorinus in his Latin Comm. (about A. D. 300), still extant in a somewhat mutilated state, makes or alludes to a distinction, perhaps, between John's *seeing* the apocalyptic visions, and *writing* them down. He first states, that John was *in metallum damnatus*, i. e. condemned to the mines in Patmos by Domitian; he then says, that he there *vidit Apocalypsin;* and then, being released after the death of Domitian, *sic postea tradidit hanc eandam quam acceperat a Domino Apocalypsin;* Bib. Max. Pat. III. p. 419. Lücke translates *tradidit* by *niedergeschrieben*, i. e. wrote down; which it does not necessarily mean, but only *to transmit* or *deliver over* to another. Victorinus says, that this *traditio* is what is meant in Rev. 10: 11, where the angel says to John: Δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι. So far as I can see, this leaves the question still undetermined, where the original *writing down* was performed. Arethas, indeed, (Comm. in Rev. vii. in Opp. oecum. p. 713 seq. and Bib. Max. Pat. IX.) states, that John wrote *at Ephesus*. But a writer of the seventh century, or late in the sixth, could have had nothing more than hearsay, in relation to this matter. Jerome, at the close of the 4th century, says of John: "In Patmos insulam relegatus, scripsit Apocalypsin;" Catal. V.

On the whole, it does not appear that in ancient times the question was urged and discussed, whether John wrote down his visions at the time when he saw them, or sometime afterwards; and consequently we can get no satisfactory answer to this question from the ancient fathers. We must resort, then, either to the nature of the case, or to the internal evidence contained in the book itself.

As to the nature of the case, we do not know enough of the particulars respecting John's residence in Patmos and his return from that place, or of the length of time that intervened between his visions and the period of his return, to decide as to the probability of his performing the task of writing after his return to Ephesus. The form of speaking in 1: 9, 10, will not decide this, viz. ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ . . . ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι . . . καὶ ἤκουσα, etc. We cannot suppose John to have written down the account of any vision, until after the vision had taken place. It would be a matter of course, in giving an account of it, to speak of the place where it happened, and to speak of it as *past*, i. e. to employ an Aorist or Praeterite tense, as in the passages above desig-

nated. Whether he wrote after his return to Ephesus, or immediately or soon after the vision had taken place, he would naturally speak as he has here spoken. Guerike, in his Fortgesetz. Beitr. p. 70, has not satisfied me of the contrary.

But there are internal evidences in the book itself, which render it probable that the act of writing, if not simultaneous with the visions, (which cannot well be deemed probable), was at least not long deferred. In 10: 4, the writer tells us, that when he heard the seven thunders utter their voice, he immediately prepared himself to write down what they had uttered, ἔμελλον γράφειν, the *proximate* future. A voice from heaven, however, forbade him to disclose it. This shows, quite plainly, that he intermingled the writing with the visions, i. e. that the disclosures, which are many and diverse, are followed from time to time with the act, on the part of the Apocalyptist, of writing them down. In the like way, as it seems to me, are we to interpret the commands to write, in 14: 13. 19: 9, 21: 5. If any one should say, that a command to write down the particular things there disclosed, involves the idea that other things were not then written, and that there was no command to write those other things, I apprehend the ὃ βλέπεις γράψεις εἰς βιβλίον, in 1: 11, must be regarded as a refutation of this. And although this passage may possibly be considered as merely referring to the seven epistles to the seven churches of Asia, or at most as merely a command to write at some time, which might be sooner or later, yet 10: 4, would help to correct an exegesis of this nature, and render the supposition of a successive seeing of visions and writing them down quite probable.

It is hardly worthy a passing notice, that some have objected to the supposition of writing down the Apocalypse at Patmos, that John, in exile at such a place, cannot well be imagined to have possessed the requisite materials for writing. But had not Ovid such materials at Tomi? Was not Patmos very near the Asian shore, and at a small distance from Ephesus itself, where John had so many friends and devoted followers? What could be easier than for him to be secretly supplied with the materials for writing, and thus maintaining a correspondence with the churches over whom he had watched? What obliges us moreover to suppose, that he was not allowed to take such materials with him? The Romans had two forms of exile; the one was *deportatio*, i. e. perpetual banishment to a certain place, with loss of rights and property; the other was *relegatio*, which might be a temporary or perpetual banishment, without being deprived of property or other civil rights. Who can show us, that the exile of John was not one of the latter class? Such was that of Ovid, as may be seen in his Trist. II. 135 seq.; and Tertullian twice applies *relegatur* to the banishment of John, Apol. 5. De Praesc. Haeret. c. 36; and Jerome does the same.

Finally, the *congruity* of the epistles to the churches, when considered as coming from one removed at a distance, is much more evident and satisfactory; specially as it respects the church at Ephesus. I do not say that John, while living at Ephesus, could not have addressed an epistle to the church there. But this may be said, viz., that we find no example of such a thing in any other of the New Testament epistles, and such a transaction wears in itself an air of improbability. It is more probable that the communication was from Patmos. The writer speaks of himself as an exile, or at any rate as being *ἐν θλίψει*, at the time when he wrote. He addresses the seven churches as being persecuted and oppressed, 2: 10, 13. 3: 10, al. How could this be the case, if Nero were already dead, and he returned from exile in consequence of this? Would not the churches also have experienced the like deliverance? The probability of John's having written at Patmos amounts to almost a certainty, when all these things are joined together and placed in a clear light.

II. At what Time was the Apocalypse written?

A much more serious question than either of those which we have just discussed, and one about which very different and even opposite opinions have been formed and maintained, by critics of high standing. A majority of the older critics have been inclined to adopt the opinion of Irenaeus, viz., that it was written during the reign of Domitian, i. e. during the last part of the first century, or in A. D. 95 or 96. Most of the recent commentators and critics have called this opinion in question, and placed the composition of the book at an earlier period, viz. before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The opinion of the ancient Christian fathers seems to rest mainly upon the declaration of Irenaeus, in Haeres. V. 30, who lived at the close of the second century, and who is the first writer that we know of, who has said anything expressly on the point now before us. The declaration alluded to runs thus: *Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη [ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις], ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιάνου ἀρχῆς*, i. e. 'the Apocalypse was seen, not long ago, but almost in our generation, near the end of Domitian's reign.' These words of Irenaeus are cited verbatim by Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. III. 18, and V. 8. See also III. 23. III. 20 ad fin. Jerome (Catal. V.) has combined the account of Eusebius, particularly the passage in his Chronicon on the 14th year of Domitian (quoted above on p. 260), with that of Irenaeus, and says: "Quarto decimo igitur anno, secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano, in Patmos insulam relegatus [Johannes], scripsit Apocalypsin." Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. III. 23) quotes a passage from the *Quis Salvus Dives* of Clemens Alexandrinus (§ 42), which

runs thus: *Ἐπειδὲ γὰρ, τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἔφεσον*, etc. The tyrant here meant is probably Domitian; at least, although he is not named by Clement, it is clear that Eusebius so understood the matter. Tertullian has also been supposed by some, to be of the like opinion. His words run thus: "Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate; sed qua et homo, facile coeptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat;" Apologet. c. 5. In the preceding context he speaks of Nero's persecution, and in the words quoted he seems to intimate, that Domitian soon relaxed from his persecution, and recalled those whom he had banished. But Eusebius (Ecc. Hist. III. 20), although he cites this passage of Tertullian, states that only restoration of the exiles took place *after the death* of Domitian, and by a decree of the Senate. Eusebius then adds, that 'according to tradition, John returned from Patmos at that period, and resumed his abode at Ephesus.' How Eusebius understood Tertullian, seems to be clear; but the words of Tertullian himself leave the matter in doubt, and nothing certain can be drawn from them in respect to John. In another passage he says: "Ubi [sc. Romae] apostolus Johannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." Nothing here, or in the context, decides whether he regarded this as happening under Nero or Domitian.

Origen, when he speaks of John's banishment, merely says that '*ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς* condemned him to it,' without saying anything which would decide whether he meant Nero or Domitian; Orig. in Matt. Opp. ed. de la Rue, III. p. 720.

Victorinus, whose Latin Commentary on the Apocalypse has already been mentioned, when commenting on Rev. 10: 11, says: "Quando hoc [Apocalypsin] vidit Johannes, erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Caesare." A little after: "Interfecto Domitiano . . . Johannes, de metallo dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandam quam acceperat a Domino Apocalypsin;" in Bib. Max. III. p. 419. Again, on p. 420: "Intelligi oportet tempus quo scriptura Apocalypsis edita est; quoniam tunc erat Caesar Domitianus . . . Unus extat, sub quo scribitur Apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet."

Sulpicius Severus and Orosius, both contemporaries with Augustine, exhibit the like view of the time when the Apocalypse was written. Thus Sulpicius: "Domitianus . . . persecutus est Christianos, quo tempore Joannem Apostolum in Pathmum relegavit;—ubi ille . . . librum sacrae Apocalypsis . . . conscriptum edidit;" Hist. Sac. Lib. II, in Bib. Max. Pat. VI. p. 144 E. So Orosius: "Domitianus . . . persecutionem in Christianos . . . imperavit; quo tempore etiam . . . Johannes Apostolus in Pathmum relegatus fuit;" Lib. VII. ubi supra, p. 436 H.

It is needless to produce more quotations. The like sentiment may

be found in Gregorius Turonensis (Cent. VI.), I. 24; Isidorus Hispalensis (Cent. VII.), cap. 73 in Johannem; Marianus Scotus also says: "Sub Domitiano Johannes ... in Patmum insulam relegatus, Apocalypsin vidit." The opinion of Jerome has already been stated above, in connection with that of Eusebius.

To the many Latin writers, already adduced, might be added several more Greek ones. The book De XII. Apostolis, attributed to Hippolytus, makes mention of *Ἰωάννης ... ὑπὸ Δομετιάνου ... ἐξορισθεὶς ἐν Πάτμῳ, ἐν ᾗ ... Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθεάσατο*; in Opp. Hippol. App. p. 30. ed. Fabr. Of the same purport is a passage from the Martyrium Timothei, produced by Photius in Codex 254. So also Suidas under the word *Δομιτίανος*. The last two writers belong to Cent. XI.

It is plain, then, that an ancient tradition existed, and was propagated through succeeding ages, that the Apocalypse was written near the close of Domitian's reign, i. e. about A. D. 95, for Domitian died in September of 96. When such a report commenced we are unable to say; but Irenaeus is the first writer, so far as we know, who has recorded it. And although the *ἑωράθη*, in the passage of Irenaeus (quoted above on p. 263) has been differently interpreted by different critics, (e. g. the ancient Latin translator of Irenaeus renders it *visum est*, viz. the beast; Wetstein applies the verb to John himself; Storr, to the name of the beast), yet I cannot think that any other Nominative than *Ἀποκάλυψις* can be fairly supplied here. So most of the ancients clearly understood the matter; and we may well acquiesce in their judgment, for it is supported by the obvious principles of interpretation.

If there were nothing else of a different tenor to be found respecting the question before us, we should feel obliged to concede, that the opinion is no longer to be controverted, which fixes upon the latter part of Domitian's reign as the period when the Apocalypse was composed. But we know that the voice of antiquity is not uniform, in relation to this subject. Epiphanius, speaking of John, says that "he wrote his Gospel, *μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος*," i. e. he places John's banishment and return under the reign of Claudius, when the Jews were banished from Rome; edit. Colon. p. 434, Haer. 51. Again, speaking of John he says: *προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου ... δεικνυμένου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν λόγου προφητικοῦ*, i. e. 'who prophesied in the time of Claudius ... the prophetic word according to the Apocalypse being disclosed.' This opinion of Epiphanius stands alone, among the ancients. From what source he drew it, it is difficult to conjecture, unless indeed, (as seems quite probable), he supposed John's banishment to Patmos to stand connected with the banishment of the Jews from Rome by Claudius, A. D. 54. Acts 18: 2. Yet as this decree of exile respected only

the *city of Rome*, and had regard to *Jews* and not to Christians in general, it would seem to have no bearing on the case. We must dismiss this matter, therefore, merely with the remark, that no good grounds of Epiphanius' opinion are given, nor can any be well imagined. It would seem that it must have been some vague rumour, which this (oftentimes uncritical) father had heard, and which he has reported in the passage before us; or else he must have drawn his own conclusion from the banishment abovementioned. Better ground has another report, which may be here and there found among the ancients, viz., that John wrote the Apocalypse during banishment to Patmos under the reign of Nero. From A. D. 64 to the time of his death (in June A. D. 68), Nero carried on a furious persecution against Christians, and *banishment* was a very common thing under the Roman government. It might therefore have been inflicted upon John, the leading teacher of Christianity at Ephesus, the capital of Asia Minor.

The earliest notice of such an opinion may be found in a Fragment of an ancient Latin writing, (probably about A. D. 196), first published by Muratori in his Antiq. Ital. III. p. 854, and attributed by many (yet without good reason) to the presbyter Caius. C. F. Schmid has copied it into his *Offenbarung Johannis*, p. 101 seq. The work contains a kind of a catalogue of the New Testament Scriptures; and among other things it says: "Paulus, sequens praedecessoris sui Johannis ordinem, nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali." John, then, in the first place, was Paul's *predecessor*, according to this writer; next, as John has written only to seven churches by name, in the Apocalypse, Paul, following his example, wrote only to the same number by name; and thirdly, as the consequence of this, Paul must of course have had the example of John in his eye. Now as Paul suffered martyrdom under Nero, who died in A. D. 68, it follows that John, according to the author of this Fragment, must have written the Apocalypse before that period; how long before, the Fragment does not intimate.

Thus much for this incondite composition, on which, as it seems to me, no great reliance can be placed for anything of serious importance. It may, however, be regarded as conveying the common impression of that part of the church where the author lived, that Paul, as a writer of seven epistles, was *preceded* by John, who wrote to the seven churches of Asia Minor.

The passage in Tertullian, which is quoted on p. 264 above, is applied by Newton to the banishment of John by Nero. But it contains no certain evidence respecting the *time* when banishment took place. It is true, indeed, that there is a passage in Jerome, which seems directly to assert, that Tertullian meant to convey the idea, that what happened to John was during the life of Nero. In Advers. Jovin. I. 26, Jerome

says: "Refert autem Tertullianus, quod a Nerone missus in ferventis olei dolum, purior et vegetior exiverit quam intraverit." But immediately before this passage, he speaks of John as exiled by *Domitian*. How, it has been asked, could he thus contradict himself, in the same breath? To avoid this it has been proposed to read *Romae*, instead of *a Nerone*. But all Mss. and editions are against it. Nor do I apprehend that Jerome's credit for consistency is much jeoparded by the passage in question, as it now stands. When Jerome says *a Nerone*, he is only giving his views of what Tertullian had said, and not his own opinion. Jerome's view of Tertullian's opinion may be correct. Besides, Tertullian does not here speak of John's *exile*.

In the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, the title page declares, that *it was written in Patmos, whither John was sent by Nero Caesar*. But the value of this testimony is somewhat weakened by the fact, that the old Peshito or Syriac version of the second century, has never comprised the Apocalypse. The version of this book which now appears in our Syriac New Testament, was copied in the East by Caspar, whose residence was in western Asia; from him it came into the hands of Scaliger the younger; thence to the library of Leyden; and there it was copied, and then published by L. de Dieu, in 1627. From this edition, the Syriac Apocalypse in the London and Paris Polyglots was taken. It is somewhat doubtful whether this version of the Apocalypse belongs to the so-called *Philoxenian* version, which was made about A. D. 508. It would rather seem, however, that there was a version of the Apocalypse into Syriac earlier than the Philoxenian; for Ephrem Syrus, in his Commentaries (century IV.), often appeals to the Apocalypse; and it is generally supposed that he did not understand Greek, and therefore must have read it in *Syriac;* see Hug's Introd. § 65. If this view is correct, then does the inscription mentioned above acquire additional importance. It becomes an early, as well as a plain, testimony respecting the current opinion in the East, with regard to the time when the Apocalypse was written.

Andreas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, (of an uncertain age, but probably near the commencement of the sixth century), in his Greek Commentary on the Apocalypse which is still extant, says, in his remarks on Rev. 6: 12, that there are not wanting those who apply this passage to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; but at the same time he gives his own opinion, that it is rather to be applied to the coming of Antichrist, etc. Again on Rev. 7: 1 he says: "These things are referred by some to those sufferings which were inflicted by the Romans upon the Jews;" but he gives his opinion again, that they may with more propriety be referred to the coming of Antichrist. And so (on Rev. 7: 2) he also says: 'Although these things happened in part

to Jewish Christians, who escaped the evils inflicted on Jerusalem by the Romans, yet they more probably refer to Antichrist,' etc.; in which there appears to be somewhat of inconsistency, or at least of adopting a double meaning.

It is plain, then, from what Andreas says in these passages, that in his time there was one class of interpreters, who referred a part of the Apocalypse to the destruction of Jerusalem, and of course believed that this book was composed before that event took place.

Arethas, the successor of Andreas in office, who lived near the middle of the sixth century, has also left behind him a Greek commentary on the Apocalypse, which consists of little more than extracts from Andreas and other expositors. In his remarks on Rev. 1: 9 he says: "That John was banished to the isle of Patmos under Domitian, Eusebius alleges in his Chronicon." He does not appear to give his own opinion here. On Rev. 6: 12 he says: 'Some refer this to the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian, interpreting all tropically.' He then cites from Andreas, in order to show that many referred it to the time of Antichrist. But on Rev. 7: 1, he appears to speak out his own opinion: "Here then were manifestly shown to the Evangelist *what things were to befall the Jews, in their war against the Romans*, in the way of avenging the sufferings inflicted upon Christ." After averring that Josephus' history accords with the fulfilment of these predictions, he further remarks, that "these things will still more evidently happen, near the coming of Antichrist." Nothing is plainer, here, than that Arethas admitted a double sense of prophecy; and in accordance with this he might consistently find *two fulfilments* of a prediction, as he seems to have done. Still, in order to do this, he must have supposed the Apocalypse to have been composed *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. But he is even more explicit still on Rev. 7: 4, where he says: "When the Evangelist received these oracles, the destruction in which the Jews were involved, was not yet inflicted by the Romans." There can be no doubt, therefore, what his own view was, of the time in which the Apocalypse must have been written. When Lücke (p. 409) speaks of him, in reference to these passages, as *confused* and *contradictory*, he could hardly have adverted sufficiently to the fact, that in the seemingly contradictory passages, Arethas only cites the opinion of others. What Arethas says on Rev. xi. would rather afford some occasion for the remark of Lücke.

Berthold cites the *Martyrium Timothei* as exhibiting evidence of an opinion among the ancients, that John was banished to Patmos under the reign of Nero; Berth. Einleit. IV. p. 1831. The purport of what this document says, is, that 'under Nero's reign John made a voyage to sea, where some accidents befel him.' But this work is so fabulous,

and of such an uncertain age, that no serious reliance can be placed upon it.

The *Synopsis de Vita et Morte Prophetarum*, ascribed to Dorotheus bishop of Tyre, but probably not written until the sixth century, ascribes John's exile to Trajan; but it states only, that he wrote his Gospel at that time, and mentions that others fixed upon Domitian's reign for these events. The author does not seem to pretend, that he has any certain knowledge; and the whole document is of little worth. Bib. Max. III. p. 426.

Berthold (ubi supra) appeals to the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, in order to confirm the idea, that John returned from Patmos at the commencement of Vespasian's reign. But this work was written after A. D. 630, (down to which it brings its chronology). Moreover, the Chronicon has merely copied Jerome's opinion, and sets John's return in 96, under Nerva who succeeded Domitian. Besides, the Chronicon is contradictory of itself. On Olymp. 212 it makes his banishment to have happened in A. D. 78; and on Olymp. 218 it fixes it in the thirteenth year of Domitian, i. e. A. D. 94. Afterwards it says, that the time of John's exile was fifteen years; and yet it avers, that he was restored in the first year of Nerva, A. D. 96. It need not be said, after this exhibition, that the writer has thrown together all sorts of opinions, without any investigation of them, and that he had none of his own, or none which was worth any regard. It is useless to appeal to such documents.

It remains only to mention Theophylact (Cent. XI.), who says, in Pref. to Comm. in Evang. Johannis: *Ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ἐξόριστος διατελῶν, μετὰ τριάκοντα δύο ἔτη τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως*, i. e. 'when he [John] lived an exile in the island of Patmos, 32 years after the ascension of Christ.' This would be A. D. 65, and under the reign of Nero.

Such is the state of ancient testimony respecting the point now before us. It is divided mainly between the time of Domitian and that of Nero. Some solitary conjectures about the time of Claudius and of Trajan we find; but they are not entitled to any serious notice.

If now the *number* of the witnesses were the only thing which should control our judgment in relation to the question proposed, we must, so far as *external* evidence is concerned, yield the palm to those who fix upon the time of Domitian. But a careful examination of this matter shows, that the whole concatenation of witnesses in favour of this position hangs upon the testimony of Irenaeus, and their evidence is little more than a mere repetition of what he has said. Eusebius and Jerome most plainly depend on him; and others seem to have had in view his authority, or else that of Eusebius. The manner and form of the testimony plainly show this. In such a case, the concatenation of witnesses

goes to prove how widely the tradition mentioned by Irenaeus had spread, rather than to establish the degree of credit which it deserved.

I have other remarks to make on this subject; but many of them I shall defer until we have examined the INTERNAL EVIDENCE, which the Apocalypse exhibits respecting the time when it was composed. For the present I would add, that the *diversity of opinion*, which, as it seems, existed among the ancients relative to the time of composition, can well be accounted for only on the ground, that the conclusions respecting it were rather the result of *constructive exegesis*, than of definite historical tradition. John was banished to Patmos, on account of his adherence to and propagation of the Christian religion. So the ancients in mass understood Rev. 1: 9 to mean. But this passage does not say *when* this happened. Of course, so far as this is concerned, there was room for a variety of suppositions. History discloses that the Jews, under the reign of Claudius, (probably in A. D. 54), were banished from Rome, Acts 18: 2. In the early stage of Christianity, Christians and Jews were often confounded by the Romans; and Suetonius (Claudius, cap. 25) seems to attribute their banishment to Christianity, when he says, that the Jews were *tumultuantes Chresto* [Christo?] *impulsore*. Epiphanius fixes upon that period, as we have already seen, p. 265 above; and Grotius, Hammond, and Storr, labour to support this view. Again; it is certain that Nero persecuted Christianity for some three and a half years, and John was at Ephesus at least during a part of this period, viz. between A. D. 64 and 68. Consequently he might have been banished at that time, and have written the Apocalypse at Patmos; and this was supposed to be the case by some, as we have seen above. Once more; Domitian persecuted Christians for some time, and banished many of them. John was living at the period of this persecution also, and might have been banished. That such was the case, Irenaeus, and many after him, believed; as we have already seen, pp. 263 seq. above. So far as Rev. 1: 9 is concerned, there is nothing in it which contradicts either of these suppositions; certainly neither of the last two. Readers of the Apocalypse, in ancient times, who were not intent upon searching out the internal evidence throughout the book respecting the time of its composition, but expected the announcement of this merely at the outset, if anywhere, might easily be led to form different opinions as to the time referred to in 1: 9; and these opinions would of course be affected by their views of the meaning of the book. If it was viewed as in part a prediction respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, then of course the composition of the book would be looked upon as having taken place anterior to that event; if, however, all the former part of the work was referred merely to the coming of Antichrist, or to any event of the times that followed the first century, then the era of Domitian might be fixed

upon, without any apprehension of difficulty. But even this latter class of interpreters were divided. Hegesippus (in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 19. 20), and possibly Tertullian (Apol. c. 5), seem to suppose the return of John from Patmos to have happened during Domitian's lifetime. Eusebius (Chron. in ann. 14 Domit.) supposes it to have taken place under Nerva, after Domitian's death; and with him Clemens Alex. and Jerome appear to coincide, see p. 263 above. Victorinus (see p. 264 above) has added another circumstance, viz. *in metallum damnatus*, i. e. condemned to the *mines* (?) in Patmos. All this variety of opinion makes strongly against any uniform and certain historical tradition with regard to the subject before us. We have seen, also, that the Synopsis attributed to Dorotheus (p. 264 above) fixes even upon the time of Trajan for the exile of the apostle; on what ground, it would be difficult to say.

That John was banished to Patmos, and wrote the Apocalypse there, or at least saw the vision there, seems to be a fact plainly and explicitly vouched for in Rev. 1: 9; and I know of no good reason for disbelieving this. On this point, all the opinions of antiquity, discrepant in other respects, fully agree. So much John himself says in this passage, and no more. Whether other facts of his book do not imply something more definite, is another question yet to be investigated. But it is plain, that the ancient writers did not look into the book at large for the *chronology* of the composition. Beyond the testimony of John himself, there is such a diversity of views, as serves to show that mere floating reports and surmises were the basis of these views. Were not this the case, how could there have been so great a variety of opinions about a simple matter of fact?

That this is a correct view of the subject, seems to me to be strongly supported by the passage of Origen, to which allusion has already been made on p. 264 above. Mark his words: *Ὁ δὲ Ρωμαίων βασιλεύς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον· διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἑαυτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε φάσκων ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα* [1: 9]. *Καὶ ἔοικε τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι.* Opp. in Matt. iii. p. 720, de la Rue. That is: 'The King of the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John, who bore testimony, on account of the word of truth, to the isle of Patmos. John, moreover, teaches us things respecting his testimony [or martyrdom], without saying who condemned him when he utters these things in the Apocalypse. He seems also to have seen the Apocalypse [i. e. the visions of the Apocalypse] in the island.' This remarkable passage deserves special notice. We cannot suppose Origen to have been ignorant of what Irenaeus had said, in V. 30; see p. 263 above. Yet

Origen does not at all refer to Irenaeus, as exhibiting anything decisive with regard to which Roman emperor it was who banished John. He does not even appeal to tradition, as according with the report of Irenaeus. Moreover he notes expressly, that John has not himself decided this matter in the Apocalypse, *μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε*. If now he regarded the opinion of Irenaeus as decisive in relation to this subject, how could he have failed, on such an occasion, of appealing to it? It is evident that he refrains from giving an opinion himself, on the point in question, because John has omitted to decide it in the passage referred to, viz. 1: 9. If now he had considered tradition as deciding it, would he not naturally have said so? We cannot well come to any other conclusion here, than that Origen knew of no way in which this matter could be determined; since he viewed John as having passed it by in Rev. 1: 9. Such an opinion from such a man as Origen, the greatest critical scholar of the first three centuries, is entitled to very serious consideration; and I do not perceive how we are to draw less from it than the conclusion, that Origen did not regard the question respecting the *time* when the Apocalypse was written, as settled by anything within his knowledge.

That Irenaeus himself possessed any other knowledge, in relation to the *time* when the Apocalypse was composed, than what he drew from the exegesis of Rev. 1: 9, may well be doubted. But on this point more will be said, after we have taken a view of the internal evidences of the book itself.

I. THE SEVEN EPISTLES. Whoever reads them with attention, will easily perceive that there is developed in them a state of the churches in various respects different from that which is disclosed in the *earlier* epistles of Paul. Scarcely, if at all, in any of these epistles, is a state of active persecution developed, which proceeded, or could proceed, to the destruction of life and the confiscation of property. In some of them, e. g. 2 Thess. ch. i., we see indeed that a bitter hostility towards Christians is indicated; but it seems to proceed from those who not improbably were superstitious and unbelieving Jews. Occasional references elsewhere are also to be found, of more or less of opposition on the part of the world, whether Jews or Gentiles, against Christianity. Nothing could be more natural or probable than this. But of persecution unto imprisonment, banishment, and death, Paul scarcely speaks, until his own life was put in peril, after the Neronian persecution began.

How different in the epistles prefixed to the Apocalypse! The first annunciation of the coming of Christ, Rev. 1: 7, is accompanied with the declaration, that "they who pierced him shall see him, and all the tribes of the land shall wail because of him." Who then were they that *pierced him*? Were they not the *Jews*? If the Romans took any

part in doing this, it was a merely ministerial and subordinate part. The Jews were the instigators and the proper authors of the deed.

Here then, on the very front of the book, is exhibited a title-page, as it were, indicative of a conspicuous part of the contents of the work. The punishment of the unbelieving and persecuting Jews must follow the coming of the Lord; and this it is one leading object of the book to illustrate and confirm. If so, then the *prediction* must have preceded the event predicted.

But apart from this leading hint respecting the design of the book, the seven epistles contain intimations throughout, more or less direct, that an active state of persecution was going on when the epistles were written. This has already been somewhat fully developed on pp. 222 seq. above, and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say, that the very mold in which all these epistles were cast, is plainly indicative of the circumstances in which they were written. They were circumstances of peculiar trial. A great contest was going on. Some of the churches had swerved from the fervor of their first love; in others, heresies had risen up; in some, wicked seducers were playing their part. These churches, moreover, seem to have had regular officers, and to have been orderly constituted. The ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας is everywhere addressed, at first; but through him the whole body of the church are admonished and encouraged.

Several of these churches, perhaps most of them, had been planted by Paul; but they had been built up and nourished, as it would seem, by John. When Paul addressed the church at Ephesus, the state of things was plainly quite different from what the letter to the same church indicates, when John wrote. Some seven or eight years probably had intervened, between Paul's letter and the epistle of John; a time sufficient to account for any of the changes which seem to have taken place. The person who addresses the seven churches, plainly regards himself as connected with them all, and as having the superintendence of all. He considers himself as entitled to utter threatenings, or promises of reward; to command discipline, or to insist on patience and obedience. In a word, all this seems well to chime in with the view of the ancients, viz., that John, some time before the destruction of Jerusalem, came to Ephesus and dwelt there, and went out thence on missionary excursions into the regions round about that city.

All this, indeed, may be true of the churches and of John's relation to them, in the time of Domitian, some quarter of a century later; and so the argument is not conclusive. But all this moreover may be true, respecting the Asiatic churches in Nero's time. There is no improbability in it, but the contrary; so that the objections which have been made to the *early* composition of the Apocalypse, on the ground that

the condition of the seven Asiatic churches in Nero's time does not correspond to the tenor of the seven epistles to them, has no good foundation.

II. In Rev. 6: 9, 10, we are presented with a view of martyrs already slain in the cause of Christ, crying for retribution upon their persecutors. Their petition is favourably received; but they are bidden to "wait a little time, until their fellow servants and brethren, *who were to be slain as they had been*, should complete their number," v. 11. Lücke and Ewald assign the reign of Galba, (the last half of A. D. 68), as the period in which the Apocalypse was written. But it is a fact, in respect to which the voice of antiquity is but one, that the persecution begun by Nero ceased with his death, (June 9th, A. D. 68). How then could such a view as this be held out by the writer of the Apocalypse, after the persecution was already suspended, or rather, after it had ended? If it be said, that the interval between Nero's death and the time when the news of it reached Ephesus, or Patmos, may still be selected, as the one in which the Apocalypse was written; this answer will hardly meet the case. But very few days could elapse before it must be known at Ephesus. In less than twenty-seven days the news had reached Alexandria in Egypt, and brought out an edict there in which Galba was acknowledged as emperor; see Rhein. Musaeum für Philol. etc. II. p. 68. Lücke, p. 253. In less than half of that time must the news have reached Ephesus; and that John, if then at Patmos, would have been forthwith advertised by his friends, cannot reasonably be doubted. This is one, among several reasons, why the time of writing the Apocalypse cannot be deferred until after the death of Nero and the suspension of persecution under Galba; for persecution was evidently raging when the Apocalypse was written. At all events, such a passage as the one before us puts at rest the supposition, that the Apocalypse was composed under the reign of Claudius. No martyrs were then made among Christians, certainly none that we know of, by the banishment of the Jews from Rome in A. D. 54.

But there are evidences still more direct, in the Apocalypse, of its composition *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. In chap. vii. we have an account of the sealing in the forehead of 144,000 selected from *the tribes of Israel*, who were to be exempted from the impending destruction. Why from the twelve tribes of Israel? Because the destruction threatened, in connection with this event, was to overtake *Judea*. If not, why should *Jewish* Christians alone be here mentioned and selected?

III. Again in chap. xi. we have an account of John's commission to measure the inner temple, the altar, and the worshippers, while the outer part is given up to destruction by the Gentiles. How could such a command be supposed, in this case, if the temple had already been entirely destroyed, as it was by the Romans? The transaction is indeed wholly

symbolical, and indicates that all which is outward and ceremonial of Judaism is to be destroyed, while all that is inward and spiritual is to be preserved. But, although allusions to the temple might be made after its destruction, yet allusions to the altar and worshippers, in the manner here presented, cannot be deemed probable, some twenty-five years after the destruction of the whole.

If Herder, Eichhorn, and Heinrichs, are correct, in supposing that the two witnesses of Rev. 11: 3 seq. are meant to symbolize the high priests, Ananus and Jesus, who were slain by a faction in Jerusalem, then, of course, must the composition of the Apocalypse, if it be *prophetic*, precede the destruction of Jerusalem. But as these two witnesses are indubitably recognized as *Christians*, (μάρτυσί μου, v. 3), we cannot attach any weight to such an argument.

In Rev. 11: 8, the dead bodies of the witnesses are said to "lie in the street of the great city which is called *spiritually* Sodom and Egypt, where our Lord was crucified." *Sodom* and *Egypt* are names which very significantly describe the glaring vices and the oppression of the great city. But this is not specific enough for the writer. *The place where our Lord was crucified*, he adds, in order to preclude mistake. Here then is Jerusalem still surviving, active, hostile, persecuting to death the Christian martyrs. This same city it is, which in the sequel meets with the overthrow as predicted in vs. 13—19. How can we avoid the conclusion, then, that Jerusalem was the city threatened; and of course that the prediction was written before the event?

What Guerike (Fortgesetzte Beiträge, etc., p. 71 seq.) has objected to such a view of Rev. v—xi, seems to me quite inconclusive. He alleges, that a '*new* Jerusalem, could not be spoken of, as it is in 21: 1 seq., provided the old city were still remaining.' But why not? Has not John predicted the destruction of the old Jerusalem in chap. xi? And if so, then why not predict a new and more glorious city in its place, which would be the metropolis of the new spiritual kingdom? He alleges also, that 'the destruction of the literal Jerusalem is not, after all, to be regarded as foretold in the Apocalypse, but everything said in chap. xi. is to be regarded merely as *symbolical*.' Very well: *symbolical* then let it be, as to the general tenor of it. But there must be some *reality* which is the basis of symbol, and of which symbol is the representative. What then is the reality which lies at the basis of the symbolical names, *Sodom* and *Egypt*? The writer himself has told us; for he says that these names stand for "*the place where our Lord was crucified*." And was that place a literal or a figurative Jerusalem? In a word; the whole of Guerike's objection to such a view of the meaning of the passage in Rev. xi. as has been given above, depends on his exegesis of Rev. v—xi. But an exegesis, which, like his, excludes a

reference to Palestine in this part of the book, must be in the face of all the rules of interpretation that we apply to other books. If there be anything certain in the principles of hermeneutics, it is certain that they decide in favour of a reference to Judea and its capital in Rev. vi—xi. The very fact, moreover, that the destruction of Jerusalem (chap. xi) is depicted in such outlines and mere sketches, shows that it was then *future*, when the book was written. It is out of all question, except by mere violence, to give a different interpretation to this part of the Apocalypse. And to a view like this, in respect to the interpretation of the book, Lücke gives his assent; Einleit. p. 267 seq.

IV. Rev. xvii. professedly undertakes to explain the symbols of the beast, introduced at the commencement of the second catastrophe in the Apocalypse, chap. 13: 1 seq. The last verse of this chapter leaves no room for mistake as to the application of the symbol. The woman sitting upon the beast means "the great city which hath dominion over the kings of the earth." When John wrote the Apocalypse, no city but Rome could be thought of as corresponding to this description. Besides, in v. 9 the seven heads of the beast are said to symbolize "the seven hills on which the woman sitteth," i. e. the seven hills on which Rome was built, the *septicollis Roma* of the Latin writers. There is no room for mistake here. And as little room, it seems to me, is there for mistake, in another part of the same explanatory chapter, viz. v. 10. Here it is said, that the seven heads of the beast also symbolize *seven kings*, viz. of Rome. The writer proceeds: "Five are fallen; one is; the other has not yet come, but when he shall come, he will remain but for a short time." That the Roman emperors were usually styled βασιλεῖς, by the Greeks, needs no proof. That the line or succession of *emperors* is here meant, and not the primitive kings of Rome, is certain from the connection of the five with the one *who is*, and the one *who is to come*. We have only to reckon then the succession of emperors, and we must arrive with certainty at the reign under which the Apocalypse was written. If we begin with Julius Caesar, it stands thus: Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius; these make up the five who have *fallen*. Of course the Apocalypse was written during the reign of Nero, who is the sixth. If, with some critics (Ewald, Lücke, and some others), we commence with Augustus, then the Apocalypse was written during the short reign of Galba, who succeeded Nero. That the first mode of reckoning is the proper one, I shall endeavor fully to show in the Commentary on Rev. 13: 3 and 17: 10, and in the Excursus connected with these passages. At most, only an occasional beginning of the count with Augustus can be shown, in the classic authors. The almost universal usage is against it. The probability on other grounds is against Ewald and Lücke. Every part of

the Apocalypse shows, as we have seen, that persecution was raging and instant, when the book was written. But this could not be true, at most, but a few days after Nero's death. Besides; when the writer adverts to *the shortness of time* in which the seventh king would reign, (which fits Galba especially, as he reigned but seven months), why, in case he wrote during the reign of Galba, should he wholly overlook the shortness of his reign, and advert in this respect merely to the succeeding reign of Otho? There is moreover, as it seems to me, a plain reference in Rev. 13: 10, to the *future* death of Nero, as well as to his then present cruelties: "If any one sends into exile, he shall go into exile: if any one kills with the sword, he shall be slain with the sword. Here is the faith and patience of the saints;" i. e. present circumstances call on them to exercise faith in the preceding declaration and in the promises of God, and patience under their sufferings. All this is very apposite to the time of Nero; but hardly to that of Galba.

Lücke seems to have been led to adopt his opinion in respect to the time of Galba, principally by Rev. 17: 8, 11, in which it is said of the beast: ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι, καὶ παρέσται. The οὐκ ἔστι seems to say, that he who is spoken of, is no longer living. But I cannot regard this matter in such a light. Nothing is more common in the predictions of the prophets, than the use of the Praeter and the Present, in order to designate *future* things. John seems simply to mean, that the *beast* first exists as king, then disappears or dies, and afterwards (as was generally supposed and had been predicted by the μάντεις) will reappear. If οὐκ ἔστιν obliges us to suppose that Nero was already dead, then why does not καὶ αὐτὸς ὄγδοός ἐστι, in v. 11, oblige us to suppose that Nero had already reappeared and become the eighth emperor? And still further; why must we not interpret the καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει as indicating, that Nero, having already reappeared, is now soon to go to destruction a second time? It cannot be, that from such forms of expression as these, under such circumstances, the actual chronology of events is to be settled. The writer means simply to say, that the beast symbolizes one of whom it might be said: "He was, and is not, and will reappear."

I might also add here, that the manner in which John speaks of the beast in Rev. xiii. seq., sometimes using this symbol generically for the Roman sovereignty, and sometimes specifically for the reigning emperor, indicates that in the latter case Nero is meant. To whom besides can 13: 3 (the deadly wound and the healing) be applied? Who but Nero was the violent persecutor of the church at that period, in the Roman empire? It is the destruction of this beast which John predicts; and from the manner in which he does it, it would seem that this beast must have then been living. We cannot indeed rationally sup-

pose John to have believed the heathen predictions, that Nero would rise from the dead and actually reappear as emperor. The most that we can reasonably suppose, is an allusion to the common report, and in this way to give a hint as to the individual who is meant to be designated by the beast. In short, the more I reflect on these circumstances, the more am I compelled to believe, that John wrote his book pending the Neronian persecution.

For further illustration of these difficult passages, I must refer the reader to the Commentary and Excursus, as mentioned above. My present purpose is a limited one, viz., merely to get at the internal evidence of the *time* when the book must have been written. Whether Lücke and Ewald are in the right, when they begin the reckoning of the emperors with Augustus, or whether those who begin it with Julius Caesar are more correct, will make only a few months of difference, at the most, as to the time in which the Apocalypse was written. In either case, it must have been composed *before* the destruction of Jerusalem.

If Abauzit and Herder are right in their exegesis, which assigns all that is said in chap. vi—xix, to prediction respecting *Judea*, then of course must the Apocalypse have been composed before Palestine was overrun and Jerusalem destroyed by the Romans. But it is not possible to vindicate such an exegesis of Rev. xiii—xix, without abandoning some of the main principles of interpretation; and, of course, I shall not attempt to build any argument on grounds such as they assume.

Eichhorn (Einleit. § 157), and after him Bleek (Zeitschrift, etc., II. p. 251), assume that Vespasian is the sixth emperor; under whom, of course, the Apocalypse was written. Consequently, they begin with Augustus, and omit Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. But at all events the omission of these three emperors is without any good authority. For although, from the shortness and turbulent nature of their reign, Suetonius speaks of the occurrences under them as a *rebellio trium principum* (in Vesp. 1), yet the same historian regularly includes them, in their proper place, among the twelve Caesars whose lives he writes; and Tacitus in like manner gives a somewhat detailed account of their sovereignties, Hist. Lib. I. seq. How can we rest a critical decision on grounds so arbitrary as the assumption in question?

Finally, it is not unimportant to remark, that the Apocalypse contains frequent declarations, at the beginning and at the close, that the things predicted therein will *speedily take place*. Of course it is reasonable, to interpret these declarations as having respect at least to the main body and leading part of the book. Yet it is not necessary to apply them to such brief passages as those in chap. xx. seq., which show, by their very nature, that the fulfilment of them ἐν τάχει is out of question. Now un-

less the main part of the work before us was fulfilled ἐν τάχει, the declarations in question can hardly be deemed correct. See Rev. 1: 1. 11: 14. 22: 7, 12, 20; comp. 2: 16. 3: 11. To what events then can we reasonably assign the declarations in Rev. vi—xix, if the destruction of Judea and the fall of persecuting Rome be not included? And if they are, then the Apocalypse must have been written previous to these events.

Having thus completed our view of the *internal* evidence of the Apocalypse respecting the *time* of its composition, it may be proper briefly to notice some objections of Guerike, drawn from this source, *against* the earlier composition of the work. In his Fortgesetzte Beiträge (p. 81 seq.), he endeavours to show, that a longer time would be requisite, in order to bring the seven churches to the state which the apocalyptic epistles develops, than could have elapsed between their first conversion under Paul and his associates, and the year A. D. 68 or 69. But besides the fact, that we do not know when several of the churches mentioned in the Apocalypse were first formed, I do not perceive any force in the allegations of Guerike. From seven to ten years is enough for any change of original character in the churches; at least for any such change as the seven epistles indicate. It has indeed been alleged, that the sects of the Nicolaitans and others mentioned in two of these epistles, could not have been formed and matured so early. But it is now generally conceded, and so even by Guerike himself, that the names given to the heretical persons mentioned in Rev. ii. iii. are not *proper* names, but merely *symbolical* ones. Of course, it is not necessary to suppose the existence of organized sects, having such distinctive names. Persons, who acted like Balaam of old and enticed others to idolatry and its associate vice fornication, there may have been in some of the seven churches; and in fact it seems clear, that such there were.

Guerike objects, moreover, to the *earlier* date of the Apocalypse, that 'the Gospel and Epistles could not have been composed until after the year 70; and if the Apocalypse was written before this, it seems wonderful to him, that John should have made no reference to it in his other and later books.' But is not the argument quite as valid, when turned the other way: If John wrote the Apocalypse *after* his Gospel and Epistles, is it not strange that he did not refer to them? Guerike labours, indeed, to show that the Apocalypse does refer to those other books; but what is the nature of his argument? Mere similarity of sentiment. That anything like a direct quotation or recognition of the Gospel or Epistles, is contained in the Apocalypse, he has not at all made out; nor can it be made out.

Still more unfortunate is Guerike's argument from the comparative

style of the Gospel and the Apocalypse of John. The former, (and so the Epistles), is not unaptly conformed to the Greek idiom; the latter, he says, is full of Hebraisms, and the like. How came this? 'John,' says he, 'wrote his Gospel in Ephesus or its neighbourhood, when in the midst of his intercourse with Greeks. But he was at Patmos so long, and moreover in such extreme old age, that he forgot his better Greek style, and relapsed to his former Hebraistic diction and method.' It will not be required of me, to show the improbability of such a supposition. John's exile, whether under Nero or Domitian, could not have been long; for neither persecution lasted longer than about three and a half years. And would a man forget a language which he had spoken for half a century, if not more, during that period? Not to mention, that the few persons at Patmos, with whom John could have intercourse, were probably Greeks.

Much more probable is the reverse of all this. If John wrote the Apocalypse not long after he came to Asia Minor, it is quite probable that his Greek was then strongly tinctured with Hebraism; and such is the style of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, if he did not write his Gospel and Epistles until some ten or twelve years after this, there was room for him to become more conformed to the Greek idiom; as in fact he appears to be, in his Gospel and Epistles. The natural order of things is thus preserved; and the probability is clearly on its side.

When Guerike suggests (p. 87 seq. ut sup.), that 'the Apocalypse must probably have been written *after* the Gospel, because it has given so much fuller views of the expansion and development of the kingdom of God;' I cannot perceive the force of his reasoning. The Gospel of John professes to adduce evidence *that Jesus is the Christ*, John 20: 30, 31; the Apocalypse professedly teaches the certainty, *that the kingdom of God will fully come.* Must an author depart from his particular design in one book, in order to repeat the things which he has said in another?

The suggestion has often been made, that the fiery phantasy or lively imagination everywhere exhibited in the Apocalypse, can with more probability be predicted of John at some sixty years of age, than at eighty-five or ninety. And speaking of this subject *more humano*, the suggestion seems to be well founded. But Guerike (p. 94) insists that 'this is nothing to the purpose, inasmuch as John was *inspired*.' But has he never read, that "the spirit of the prophets *is subject to the prophets*?" Does he not know, that the inspired writers exhibit as much diversity of character, in respect to style, as any other authors? And all these traits of style, moreover, are in all cases in conformity with their condition and acquirements.

In fact, so little can be made out of considerations like these, that we

need not be surprised to find that after all, Guerike, and the older writers who have maintained the *later* composition of the Apocalypse, depend most upon the testimony of Irenaeus and other ancient fathers, for the establishment of their position. What these witnesses have said, has already been exhibited above, pp. 263 seq. But no testimony, circumstanced as this is, can well establish such a point. The *internal* evidence of any writing which is not supposititious, must always outweigh testimony of such a nature, provided such evidence is sufficiently plain and ample. And the appeal may be made to every impartial reader, after the light which recent criticism has cast on this subject, whether the evidence in the Apocalypse of its being composed *anterior* to the destruction of Jerusalem, is not sufficiently plain and ample. What book in the New Testament has as many diagnostic passages in respect to time as this? We cannot safely, in the face of all these, give credit to the mere opinion of Irenaeus, that the Apocalypse was composed in the reign of Domitian.

I say this, with full recognition of the weight and value of Irenaeus's testimony, as to any matters of fact with which he was acquainted, or as to the common tradition of the churches. But in view of what Origen has said (see p. 264 above), how can we well suppose, that the opinion of Irenaeus, as recorded in Cont. Haeres. V. 30, was formed in any other way, than by his own interpretation of Rev. 1: 9? Is it reasonable to suppose, that a man of Origen's stamp, who had an insatiable curiosity about the sacred books, who spent many years in Palestine, and who moreover flourished but a few years after Irenaeus, would have been unacquainted with an early tradition, (if such there was), respecting the *time* when the Apocalypse was written? And yet he does not allude to such a thing. Irenaeus might be very honest, and doubtless even was so, in his opinion about the *time* when John saw his visions. Irenaeus, moreover, as he himself tells us, was acquainted when a youth, with Polycarp, a disciple of John. In his epistle to Florinus, (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. V. 20), he says, that *παῖς ὤν* he saw Polycarp and listened to his discourses. Irenaeus was born about A. D. 100, and did not write his book Cont. Haeres. or his epistle to Florinus, until he was some seventy-five or eighty years of age. Is it wonderful that he should have even made a slip in his memory, as to the *time* of John's exile, which happened a century before? Indeed, who can tell us whether Polycarp said anything to him on the subject of the *time* when the Apocalypse was written? Or if he did, whether the particular *date* was regarded as an object of importance by him? The time intervening between Nero's persecution and Domitian's, is only some twenty-seven or twenty-eight years. Banishment of Christians doubtless took place under both. There were no monthly or yearly chronicles of such mat-

ters published in those days. There was even no common and general era to which dates were referred. John lived through both persecutions. He may have been banished during both. It is not at all improbable that he was, considering his authority and influence at Ephesus, the Roman capital of Asia Minor. Of course it was easy, a century afterwards, to confound the two periods, as to such events as might have happened under either. The most lively and impressive recollections of Irenaeus's times, would be those of the nearest persecution. It was easy and natural for Irenaeus, then, to attribute to the latter the writing of the Apocalypse, provided no certain tradition had fixed it earlier. Irenaeus was at Lyons when he wrote his book on Heresies; and this was far away from the centre of early ecclesiastical traditions. Without impeaching, then, his character or his credit, we may still believe that his exegesis of Rev. 1: 9 was not correct. We can scarcely be authorized to attribute to him any nice *critical* investigations in respect to the Apocalypse. The opinions which he gives, in some passages of his works, respecting the meaning of that book, forbid us to do so. *Salva fide*, then, we may suppose him in this case to have been honest, but mistaken in his opinion.

After the view of ancient testimony which has been given above, it is almost superfluous to repeat, that all succeeding writers hang upon Irenaeus as their support. The testimony in respect to the matter before us is evidently *successive* and *dependent*, not coëtaneous and independent. We may safely follow then the plain and unequivocal evidences of the time when the Apocalypse was written, which are contained within the book itself, and have already been exhibited in the preceding pages. No other evidence can do away the force of the author's own declarations.*

* It was only after a great portion of the present section was in type, and some of it struck off, that Guerike's Introduction to the New Testament (1843) came into my hands; which, so far as he is concerned in the present discussion, would, if I had been able earlier to consult the book, have superseded any answer to his objections. In his new work, he has fully *retracted* his former opinions in respect to the *time* when the Apocalypse was written; see pp. 283 seq., specially Note 4 on pp. 285 seq., and also pp. 531 seq. In these passages the subject of the *time* is summarily, but well and ably, discussed. In particular, there is one thing in his Note above referred to which is *new*, and if well grounded, gives an entirely new shape to the testimony of Irenaeus, which is cited above on p. 263, and which seems to have been the principal support of the opinion adopted by so many of the ancient fathers, and hitherto by most of the churches in modern times, viz. the opinion that John wrote the Apocalypse during the reign of Domitian. Guerike suggests, that when Irenaeus says, "that the Apocalypse was seen not long ago, but almost in our generation, *πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς*," that the adjective *Δομετιανοῦ*, (for *adjective* it may be, and if so, it is one which is *generis communis*, and not the proper name of Domitian), belongs, in accordance with

§ 17. *Author of the Apocalypse.*

If a solicitous inquirer in respect to the *authorship* of the Apocalypse should consult only the recent leading critics in Germany respecting

---

the Greek formations, to the name *Domitius*, and not to Domitian which would make an adjective of the form *Δομιτιανικός*. If it were a proper name, he says it should be written *τοῦ Δομετιάνου*. Now Nero's name was *Domitius* Nero, and not Domitianus, which is the name of the later emperor. It follows of course that Irenaeus himself has testified to the fact, that the Apocalypse was written in the time of Domitius Nero. Thus read and understood, all accords with the internal testimony of the Apocalypse itself.

The conjecture is very ingenious; or, if we must rank it higher, the criticism is acute and discriminating. The usual fact is, that the nouns ending in *-νος*, form adjectives by *-ικος*, in order to avoid the repetition of the *-νος*. But still I have some doubts respecting this matter, which arise from the fact, that several of the Greek fathers, and many of the Latin ones who understood Greek, do not appear to have thought here of any other than Domitian, the twelfth Caesar. It was easy, indeed, to fall into such a mistake, if it be one, on account of the near resemblance of the two names. But the leading reason which induces me to doubt, is, the very unusual appellation of *Domitius* for Nero. Could Irenaeus help feeling that his readers might be misled, by such a use of *Δομετιάνου*, in case he meant *Nero?* This seems to me rather improbable. As to the phrase, "almost in our generation," I feel no difficulty about that. Irenaeus was born near the beginning of the second century, and he might say of the Apocalypse, that "it was seen almost in his generation," whether it was seen in Nero's time (A. D. 68), or in the time of Domitian. But at all events, Guerike's new work testifies to his candour and diligence in researches of this nature; and when we consider how strenuous and unflinching he had been, both in his Beiträge and Fortgesetzte Beiträge, in maintaining the *late* composition of the Apocalypse, it must be regarded as notable testimony to the strength of the critical evidence in favour of the early origin of the Apocalypse, that so ardent a mind as that of Guerike has been led, by a more ample study of the subject, to a most full and unreserved retraction of his former views. And such would be the case, as I am fully persuaded, with every candid mind that now believes in the late origin of the book, should investigation be made as ample and as fair-minded as that made by Guerike. If he is in the right, in his criticism on the word *Δομιτιάνου*, past opinions in respect to it present one of the most singular cases of long continued and oft-repeated philological error, which has ever come to my knowledge.

Having been unexpectedly called, by the reading of Guerike's work, to a review of the subject of ancient testimony respecting the Apocalypse, I take the liberty in this Note, to suggest a few considerations, in the way of addition to or correction of what has been said above. The thoughts that I intend to express, were suggested by the reading of Guerike.

In citing the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (p. 264 above), I have conceded that Clement probably meant *Domitian*, when he speaks of the tyrant (*τυράννου*) as dying, and of John's subsequent return to Ephesus. I now doubt whether this was his meaning; first, because Nero above all other Roman emperors bore the name of *τύραννος*, among Christians of the early ages; and second-

this matter, he would scarcely suppose that there is any ground for believing that John the Evangelist and Apostle composed this book. More than half a century since, Oeder, Semler, Corrodi, and others, not only called in question the genuineness of the book, but heaped reproach and contempt upon it. Michaelis, moreover, and others doubted, whether the authorship of the apostle John is capable of being satisfactorily proved. But this was nothing new. Luther and others of his time entertained similar doubts; and even in the third century Dionysius of Alexandria, and in the fourth Eusebius of Caesarea, were skeptical in regard to the point in question.

The works of Herder and Eichhorn on the Apocalypse served, as we have already seen, to rescue this book from the neglect and aesthetical disgrace into which Oeder, Semler, and Corrodi had brought it, in Germany. But even some of those who have contributed not a little to vindicate the rhetorical honours of the book, are by no means favourable to its *apostolic* origin. The confidence with which some writers speak on this latter subject, is deserving of particular notice. "In New Testament criticism," says De Wette, "nothing stands so firm, as that the apostle John, if he be the writer of the Gospel and the first Epistle, did not write the Apocalypse; or, if the latter be his work, that he is not the author of the former;" Einleit. ins N. Test. § 189. So Ewald:

---

ly, because Clement, in connection with relating the return of John to Ephesus, tells the story of John's journeying hastily, on horseback and on foot, in pursuit of a young prodigal. This could hardly be expected of a man some ninety-five years old. But if his return was at the close of Nero's life, there is nothing improbable in the story.

Again, on p. 264, I have conceded that the passages cited from Tertullian do not decide what emperor was reigning, when John wrote the Apocalypse. I have cited, in one case, only part of a passage, without adverting at the time to the bearing which the rest of the passage would have upon the part cited. I now give the whole: "Felix ecclesia [Romana] . . . ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur; ubi Paulus Johannis [Bapt.] exitu coronatur; ubi apostolus Johannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." Now it strikes me, that Tertullian plainly means to class Peter, Paul, and John together, as having suffered at nearly the same time and under the same emperor. I concede that this is not a construction absolutely necessary; but I submit it to the candid, whether it is not the most probable.

If the preceding remarks are well founded, then Clement and Tertullian are to be ranked with those fathers, who ascribe the Apocalypse to the time of Nero, or to a period immediately afterwards. To the like purpose Guerike expresses himself, in a Note on p. 286.

Let me be indulged in one other remark. If the Gospel of John was written some eight or ten years after the Apocalypse, (and this is not only probable but almost certain), how can John be supposed to have written it ten years after the reign of Domitian, i. e. when he was some 105 years old? It is not impossible, I concede; but is it not altogether improbable?

"That the Apocalypse was not written by the same author who composed the Gospel and epistles, is clear as the light of the sun, (in aprico positum est"), Comm. p. 76. And to the same purpose F. Lücke, whose *Introduction* has been these some years before the public, but without any accompanying Commentary: "Either all criticism of the New Testament canon is but idle sport," says he, "or the result, viz. that the author of John's Gospel and first Epistle cannot be the author of the Apocalypse, stands immovably fast;" in Studien und Kritiken, II. p. 319. A still later writer, Credner (Einleit. § 267), speaks with no less confidence: "Between the author of the Apocalypse and the apostle John there exists a diversity so deeply pervading, that even to the mere supposition, that the Gospel and first Epistle were the productions of the same mind, when it had attained to higher spiritual progress, which at an earlier period could have composed the Apocalypse, no place can be given, since it would be altogether unnatural and inadmissible."

These are confident words, as all must admit. They come, moreover, from men of diverse theological sympathies and views—from men also who, it must be admitted, are highly distinguished for their acquaintance with the science of biblical criticism. Not only so, but we find other critics of great name, such as Bleek and Schott, to be in accordance with them; not to mention many others now living in Germany. It would seem to be a kind of desperate undertaking, therefore, to defend an opinion against the united voice of so many distinguished critics, differing widely in theological views, but harmoniously combining in their critical judgment concerning the Apocalypse; and there are doubtless some, who will even deem an undertaking of this nature rash or presumptuous. Yet, after an examination successively renewed through many years, I have never been able to satisfy myself, that what has been the common belief of the churches in all ages respecting the authorship of the Apocalypse, is not sustained by more and better grounds than any other opinion. I admit very fully and freely, that there are some difficulties arising from the style and manner of the Apocalypse, which lie in the way of attributing the book to John the apostle. It has been an object with me, to shut neither my eyes nor my ears against anything of this nature, or against any portion of internal evidence which might undermine the common opinion of the churches. Whether I have been the whole round of examination, those well qualified to judge can decide, when they have perused the sequel of this discussion. I have come back from the long-continued and often repeated pursuit of evidence in relation to the point before us, with the persuasion, that the argument from the testimony of the ancient Christian fathers is strongly on the side of the common opinion; and that the argument from the

style and manner of the book, or (in other words) the internal evidence, is not of sufficient strength to settle the question against the authorship of the apostle. In fact, although I find some peculiarities of style in the Apocalypse, which are, at first view, strikingly and almost strangely discrepant from the usual manner of John's Gospel and Epistles, yet there are still remaining so many features of resemblance, and, as to some prominent traits, of striking resemblance, that if the latter do not preponderate in the scale of critical judgment, they at least do very nearly hold the scales *in equilibrio*. Whether I have any just ground for pronouncing such a critical sentence, must be disclosed, and at least according to my own persuasion will be disclosed, in the discussion that follows. I hope at least to furnish the reader with materials for forming his own judgment, and do not expect or wish him to rely upon mine. I think it can be satisfactorily shown to a mind wholly unprejudiced and not preoccupied by some favorite views, that many of the words and phrases adduced from the Apocalypse, in order to show the discrepancy between this book and the other writings of John, are chosen with but little fairness and discrimination; that many others, if fully conceded, do not establish the conclusion which is based upon them; and that most of the striking points of discrepancy can be naturally accounted for, by proper views of the peculiar nature of the Apocalypse, and of the peculiar condition of John when he composed it.

I make no appeal to the common views and belief of the Christian churches, in later ages, in order to sustain myself. I shall not attempt to decry those who differ from me in opinion as heretics or neologists; nor be eager to seize occasion to express astonishment at their views and grief at their presumption. This mode of discussion presents nothing attractive to a sincere and modest inquirer after truth. It would at least be out of place, on the present occasion. Those who are well acquainted with the critical writings of such men as De Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Credner, Schott, Lücke, and Neander, must doubtless know, that they cannot have united in denying the *apostolical* origin of the Apocalypse, from any common sympathy in theological views, nor from any favouritism, on the part of some of them, towards neology. The real state of the fact is, that there are so many apparent difficulties in the way of giving credit to the alleged apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, that it may easily be believed by even a fair minded critic, who should proceed only a moderate length in the examination of the question of authorship, that grounds are not wanting to persuade one to doubt or disbelieve such an origin. Indeed, we know that such is the state of the case. My own mind, if I may be permitted to speak of myself, has in the different stages of examination, gone through a process of this sort to a certain extent. I have indeed never positively dis-

believed the *apostolical* origin of the book; but I have, in certain states of knowledge and certain stages of inquiry, been compelled to hold myself in suspense, and wait for more light. Examinations, often and even painfully protracted, have generally brought me nearer to the commonly received opinion; until, at last, I feel compelled to believe, that "they who be for it, are stronger than they who be against it." I do not pretend to absolute *certainty;* for that would be idle in such a case, and on such a point as the one before us. Yet I am satisfactorily persuaded, that the arguments *against* the Johannean origin of the book, are not adequate to overthrow it. In saying thus much, I have at least taken a less confident position than De Wette and others, as exhibited in the above extracts made from them. If I cannot show, with some good degree of probability, that they have not sufficient reasons for such confident assertions, then I will abate even from the present tone of my own much less confident positions.

To those who feel, that all doubt in respect to the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse must be a doubt as to its canonical authority and its credibility, it may be proper here to say, that *apostolical* origin is not the only or exclusive qualification of a canonical New Testament book. Mark and Luke were not apostles. It would be difficult to make out, with entire certainty, that the James and Jude, who wrote epistles bearing their name, belong to this category. It is possible, then, that the Apocalypse may be a canonical book, and worthy of credit, although written by some other person than the apostle John. If the *presbyter* John, whom Papias testifies to be "a disciple of the Lord," (in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 39), were the John named in the Apocalypse (1: 1, 4, 9. 22: 8), it is quite possible that the book might sustain the place which it occupies; although, perhaps, with some degree of abatement in the minds of some, as to the confidence which they repose in it. The honour and credit of the book are not wholly compromitted by the question respecting its author. And since this is plainly the case, we need not consider doubts in relation to this subject as being altogether and purely of a heretical character. I do not say, that doubts expressed as Oeder, Semler, Corrodi, and some others have expressed them, do not fairly belong to this category; for many of them are unreasonable and contemptuous. But we should call to mind that a Dionysius, a Eusebius, a Luther, a Schott, a Neander, and a Lücke, not to mention others, have doubted; and against these the accusation of contempt, or of undervaluing the sacred books in general, could not well be brought.

I make these remarks, not for the sake of showing that it is a matter of indifference whether a man believes or rejects the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse. Far from this. But I would fain present the true nature and importance of the question before us, and not attribute to it

an importance beyond what intrinsically belongs to it. That the substantial credit of the Revelation is not in reality at stake by reason of such a question, seems to me plain and evident. It is more a *critical*, than a theological question. Yet it is one which is not by any means destitute of interest. I must confess, and I suppose that many will sympathize with me here, that the Apocalypse would not in all respects address itself to my feelings with the same interest as it now does, if I supposed any other man than he "who leaned on Jesus' bosom" wrote it. I know of no John, and no Christian author of the primitive age, who seems to me to have been so well adapted to write it, as the affectionate friend, the beloved disciple, the speculative theologian, the strongly feeling and imaginative individual, who has developed his traits in the Gospel and Epistles of John. And this is a good reason for special interest in a composition from his hand. Yet if the book be properly placed in the Canon, although composed by another man, its real *authority* or *credibility* is not substantially the less, because John did not compose it.

We may advance, then, to the examination of the question before us, without envy and without reproach. It is our main design candidly and honestly to find out and sift the evidence which is accessible.

This evidence one might divide into two classes, viz., *external* and *internal*. But this is not altogether a convenient division, for it seems to exclude the historical testimony of the book itself. A better one, for our present purpose, would be into HISTORICAL or DIRECT, and INDIRECT. In the direct evidence I mean to comprise all *historical* testimony to the fact, that *John the apostle* was the author of the Apocalypse, whether this be in the way of direct assertion, or by declarations which fairly imply the fact. By indirect evidence, I mean all such as results from the nature of the diction, style, or sentiments of the Apocalypse, and seems to bear testimony, that the author of this book was also the author of the Gospel and Epistles which bear the name of John. In following out such a division, we are permitted, first, to adduce *the declarations of the book itself respecting its author*, then *the testimony of the early Christian fathers*, as belonging to the first class of evidence; we shall then come, in order, *to examine the style, the diction, and the doctrines of the Apocalypse*, in relation to the authorship of the book.

I. DIRECT OR HISTORICAL EVIDENCE THAT THE APOSTLE JOHN WAS THE AUTHOR OF THE APOCALYPSE.

(1) The writer of the book states, in 1: 1, 4, 9 and 22: 8, that his name is JOHN.

This statement does not appear to me, (as some have maintained), to

wear the appearance of special effort to make known himself as the author, and thus to savour of a consciousness, that the genuineness of his production might be suspected. 'Who,' it has been asked, 'but a supposititious writer, would take care to name himself in four places? This savours,' it is added, 'of a consciousness that his claims will be suspected, and of a determination to foreclose all avenues to doubt respecting the authorship of the book.'

My impression is different. The first exhibition of the name of *John*, is in the general superscription of the book, which merely makes known the person to whom the *revelation* was made. This could not well be avoided, unless the general inscription had been wholly omitted. But where among all the books of *prophecy* in the Old Testament, is there any analogy for such an omission? The book of Lamentations omits all superscription; but not so the *prophecy* of the same author. Always is the statement made *to whom* the word of the Lord, as a prophecy, came; and in conformity with this, we should of course expect to find the Apocalypse. The second case in which John's name is introduced, is in the address to the seven churches of Asia. It could not be avoided here, unless the author designed his work to be anonymous, which plainly he did not intend. The third instance (1: 9) occurs in connection with his history of the Christophany at Patmos, and his commission to address the seven churches. Here it is employed in order to assure his readers, that the revelation was made to himself in *propria persona*, not to some other person. 'He who writes what follows (he means to say) is the very person who saw and heard, in a state of spiritual ecstasy, all which he has written down.' If John were an *apostle*, this annunciation would be the more important, because it would give additional weight to his writings, in the view of those whom he addressed. The same consideration appears to occasion the final exhibition of his name, at the close of the book, when his prophecy is finished, viz. in 22: 8. It has struck me with great force, that the subscription in the *Gospel* of John, 21: 24, is altogether of the same tenor as the one before us. Thus in John 21: 24, the writer, after he had related certain things which Jesus had said respecting himself, goes on thus to describe himself: *Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα.* In Rev. 22: 8, the writer says: *κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα.* That he had been in the act of *writing* the book, when this was said, is plain from the sequel: *καὶ λέγει μοι· Μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου.* The manner and object of both these subscriptions is evidently very much the same. They differ only so far as the diverse nature of the Apocalypse required a difference; *μαρτυρῶν*, which is appropriate in

the Gospel, becoming *ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων* in the Apocalypse, on account of its addresses and visions.

If now the Apocalypse was composed by some person in the way of *forgery*, would a forger or impostor have left the name of John without some further designation of his person, so as to make sure for the credit of his book that he was an apostle? Probably he would not. Had he designed that his own book should be put to the credit of John, he would have placed the matter beyond all ordinary question, by the manner of his assurances concerning the author. The point which he knew would be doubted and called in question, he would have taken care to fortify as strongly as possible. But this he has not done. *John* is there, indeed, but we do not find *John the apostle*, nor *John the beloved disciple*, nor *John on whose bosom Jesus leaned.*

But it appears from a fragment of Papias, (in Euseb. Ecc. Hist. III. 39), that there was a *John* of some note in Asia Minor, who was a *πρεσβύτερος* and a *μαθητὴς Κυρίου*, and a contemporary in part with John the Apostle. Dionysius of Alexandria, and after him Eusebius, and since him not a few others, have thought it not improbable, that the Apocalpyse might be ascribed to John the presbyter. May not the JOHN mentioned in the Apocalypse, then, be intended to designate this individual, and the book itself be no forgery, although not written by the apostle, but a work from the hand of one who has given his true name?

The *possibility* of this cannot, indeed, be well denied. That such a man lived in Asia Minor, (*where*, I have not been able to ascertain with certainty), partly in the time of John, that he was one of Christ's disciples, and perhaps that he was a presbyter in some church of Asia, seem to be facts that cannot reasonably be questioned, although some of them cannot be certainly established. Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. III. 39) has preserved a passage from the book of Papias, entitled *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*, which is designed, in the way of introduction, to show the sources from which Papias drew his narratives. It runs thus: *Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνεκρίνον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς, ἢ Ἰάκωβος, ἢ τί Ἰωάννης, ἢ Ματθαῖος, ἤ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ, λέγουσιν;* i. e. 'When I met with any one who was a follower of the elders, I inquired after the words of the elders; what Andrew, or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James, or what John, or Matthew, or [what] any other of the disciples of the Lord, such as *Aristion* and *the presbyter John*, the disciples of the Lord, say.' Eusebius reasons from these words, (in the context ut supra), in order to show that Papias was not himself an *αὐτήκοον*, a hear-

er in person, of the apostles; and Irenaeus (cont. Haeres. V. 33. 3, 4) seems to draw from them a contrary conclusion; and hence great confusion about their meaning has taken place among many subsequent and even recent writers. But leaving this, for the present, let us simply advert to the testimony which respects the *presbyter* or *elder John*. Guerike has recently defended the position, that there is but one John mentioned here; Beiträge zur Einleit, etc., p. 4 seq. He contends, also, that there is no subsequent testimony which can be relied on, that there was a presbyter of the name of John, at Ephesus, in the days of the apostle John. I cannot assent, however, to his views respecting the testimony of Papias, whom he regards as having adverted only to one John, whose name is merely repeated along with that of Aristion, because, as he thinks, these two were the only persons named with whom Papias had a personal acquaintance. The most attentive consideration of this disputed passage in Papias, which I have been able to give it, has satisfied me in respect to the following particulars; (1) That the class of persons (apostles) as far as Matthew inclusively, were men who were dead at the time when Papias wrote. Hence he refers to them in the Praeter tense, *εἶπεν, had said*, and to himself as collecting what they had said, by the aid of others who had been conversant with them. (2) He refers to his obtaining the declarations of the presbyter John and Aristion in the like way, but he speaks of them as then living—*λέγουσιν*. Eusebius and others speak of this last clause as intimating Papias' personal acquaintance with John the presbyter and Aristion; but whatever may have been the fact, the grammatical construction of the passage will admit of no such interpretation. Of this latter opinion is Rettig also, Stud. und Krit. IV. p. 773. But (3) I cannot reason from all this as Eusebius does, i. e. I cannot draw from it the conclusion, that Papias means to say here that he had no personal acquaintance with the apostles; for in the context which immediately precedes the passage before us, the same Papias says: *Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον, ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τ' ἀληθῆ διδάσκουσιν· οὐ δὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύοσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένας τῆς ἀληθείας·* i. e. 'I took no pleasure in those who speak much, as many do, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who tell of strange precepts, but in those [who tell] of things from the Lord presented to our faith, and proceeding from truth itself,' viz. from Christ the author of truth. But to whom does all this refer? Plainly to those of whom he had just been speaking thus: *Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἑρμηνείαις, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν*, i. e. 'I shall not regret relating to thee, with explanations, *whatsoever things I formerly learned*

well from the Elders, and have well remembered, thus confirming the truth respecting them;' Euseb. H. Ecc. III. 39. How Eusebius, in reasoning upon the sequel to this passage, could so entirely overlook the passage itself as he has done, it would be difficult to explain. But nothing can be clearer, (4) Than that Papias here declares, the whole passage being taken together, first of all, his own personal inquiries of the *elders;* then, secondly, his inquiries of others who had been conversant with them. That *elders*, in this case, means the *apostles* and their associates, is clear from the explanation in the sequel, where Papias mentions Andrew, Peter, etc., as belonging to this class. The very manner of the transition to a description of the second mode of inquiry practised by him, shows that the writer is proposing another and different mode from that first described: *Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι*, etc. This decides the point, (against the opinion of Eusebius), that Papias was a disciple or hearer of at least some of the apostles; and of course that the declaration of Irenaeus (Haer. V. 30. 3, 4), viz. "Papias belonged to those *πρεσβύτεροι*, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt," and again, *Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος*, is to be fully credited. In fact the very nature of the case speaks loudly for this view of the matter. Papias was in part a contemporary with John the apostle: he was the intimate friend of Polycarp, whom all agree to have been a personal attendant upon John; and he lived, and probably was born, in Hierapolis, which was in the near neighbourhood of Colosse and Laodicea, all of which places were doubtless within the sphere of John's apostolic labours. Then the insatiable curiosity of Papias with regard to apostolic traditions, would of course have led him to resort to John, when at Laodicea, and specially to make his acquaintance in case he came to Hierapolis, which we can hardly imagine he failed to do. It is agreed, among the ancients, that Papias was for a long time bishop of Hierapolis; and it is well known, that in the early ages of Christianity men were seldom promoted to the office of a bishop, unless they were advanced in age. (Hence the title *πρεσβύτεροι*). It is probable, moreover, that Papias died a martyr in A. D. 164, (see Rettig in Stud. und Krit. IV. p. 766 seq.), and he might, therefore, have lived some twenty or more years within the first century; as Polycarp did, who became a martyr at eighty-six years of age. All these considerations serve to show, that Papias was a hearer of John the apostle; and with this also to show, that his testimony respecting another John, whom he calls *πρεσβύτερος*, is not to be readily set aside. I do not see how we can avoid the conclusion, that Papias was knowing either personally or through others, to the existence of such a person as John the presbyter, in Asia Minor, at the time when he lived and wrote.

But conceding this, what was the character and standing of this second John? *Πρεσβύτερος* Papias calls him; but is this a name of *office*, or of age? For it may be applied to either. I am inclined, (with Credner, Einl. p. 697, and Rettig. ut sup. p. 773), to believe that here it is not a name of office, but merely of age; and that this second John was called the elder, either in respect to his coming into Asia before John the apostle, or, it may be, because he was older than some other John. The order of the words favours this, viz. *ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης*; whereas, had the name of *office* been here meant, *Ἰωάννης ὁ πρεσβύτερος* would have been the usual and natural arrangement. This frees the passage, moreover, from serious difficulties. In the first part of it, the persons named seem to be ranked as official *πρεσβύτεροι*; and if *πρεσβύτερος* in the last clause is a name of *office*, then John in this clause is placed under the same category as the others. It seems to me altogether probable, that such was not the writer's intention. Both Aristion and the John in question were simply *μαθηταὶ Κυρίου*.

It seems to be doubtful, then, whether the John here named is any more a *presbyter*, than the Aristion with whom he is associated. It would appear probable, moreover, that although as a *disciple* (*μαθητής*) of Christ this John was entitled to some distinction, and so Papias made inquiries of him, yet he could not have been a person whose character was very conspicuous in the churches, nor one who did much by which he would be afterwards remembered. Certain it is, that with the passage from Papias which makes honourable mention of him, and the declaration of Eusebius, that Papias in his book frequently appealed to him as his authority for particular statements, (Hist. Ecc. III. 39), we have nothing else in all antiquity which is any more than vague report or surmise concerning him. Eusebius (ubi supra) mentions a report, in his day, that "there had been two Johns in Asia, *δύο τε ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα· καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι*, i. e. and that there were two sepulchral monuments in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of *John*." Dionysius of Alexandria (first half of Cent. III.), in his famous antichiliastic work, *περὶ Ἐπαγγελίων*, (Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VII. 25), after rejecting the notion that John Mark (Acts 13: 13) was the author of the Apocalypse, says of the second John: *Ἄλλον δέ τινα οἶμαι τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων, ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι*; i. e. 'I think [the author of the Apocalypse] to be another, and one of those [two Johns] who were in Asia, since, as they say, there are two sepulchral monuments in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of John.' These are the very words which Eusebius has quoted in the passage above cited. Eusebius' authority then, plainly, was Dionysius; and the authority of Dionysius was—*φασίν*, i. e. a vague traditional report. Jerome (near

A. D. 400) refers to this same report. In his Catal. Scriptt. c. 18, he speaks of Papias as enumerating two Johns; in c. 9, he speaks of an *alterum sepulchrum* being shown at Ephesus, besides that of the apostle John; which, in the sequel, he qualifies by saying: "Et nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistae esse;" all of which plainly shows how feeble and indistinct this tradition was. Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cent. VI.) in Topog. Christ. VII. p. 292, adverts to the report of two monuments in Eusebius; and this closes the circle of testimony to the second John. How narrow this circle is, appears very plainly from facts. Justin Martyr, Melito, Theophilus of Antioch, Apollonius, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and other later Christian fathers, say nothing of the second John. Even the Alogi, who opposed the Montanists and with them the Apocalypse, asserted that Cerinthus was the author of this book, and not the second John. The like did the presbyter Caius, at Rome, about A. D. 200. How could all this have taken place, had there been any good foundation for the surmise of Dionysius and Eusebius, viz. that the second John was the author of the Apocalypse? In truth it was mere *guessing*, on the part of Dionysius; from whom Eusebius borrowed his conjecture. Dionysius (Euseb. VII. 25) concedes that "the Apocalypse must have been written by some person whose name was *John*." But from the style and manner of the book, when compared with the Gospel and Epistles of John the apostle, he concludes, that it could not have been written by the latter. Some other John, then, must be found. He finds one in the report (φασίν), that "there were two monuments in Ephesus, inscribed with the name of John." This fell in with the strong bent of his inclination, when he wrote his book περὶ Εὐαγγελίων against the Millenarian bishop, Nepos, who leaned upon the Apocalypse, and who, relying upon its declarations, confidently urged them in his own favour. To diminish from the weight of this authority, was the evident object of Dionysius, and so, although with much caution, he decried the value of the Apocalypse. But let it be noted, that he does not even attempt to say, that tradition assigned the authorship of the Apocalypse to the second John. He appeals to tradition only to show, that there were two Johns at Ephesus; and then he *conjectures*, that the second John might have written the book. And this is all which Eusebius has to say respecting this matter. He plainly had nothing else to relate concerning it, except what he found in Dionysius. Equally plain is it, that such a conjecture in regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse never had any considerable circulation in the primitive ages of Christianity. It is echoed, or adverted to, from no other quarter. The *second* John, if an actual personage (which I do not deny), was an obscure one, in whom succeeding times neither felt nor manifested any

special interest. The manner in which Jerome speaks of the subject, (see above), shows very plainly what a mere floating rumour he considered the whole affair to be.

We have now come to a point, from which we may take a more definite view of our subject. *How can we reasonably suppose the second John to have been the author of the Apocalypse?*

I can scarcely expect contradiction, after all that has recently been written concerning the Apocalypse, when I aver that no ordinary man could have composed this book. The rhetorical worth and eminence of the book are happily no longer subjects of denial or doubt; at least this is true in respect to the great mass of critics on the sacred writings. A man deeply versed in the Old Testament prophets, the writer of the Apocalypse must have been. The truth of this statement shines forth from every page, and is one of the most prominent features of the whole work. A man of considerable information in other respects, also, the author must have been. Witness so many names of the precious stones so fitly chosen, and many other names of a variety of objects in the Apocalypse. A Hebrew—yea a Hebrew of the Hebrews—the author must certainly have been. The whole book is evidently made up of Hebrew thoughts clothed in Greek costume. Nor is this all. The author must have stood on a lofty preëminence among the churches of Asia, in order to entitle him to address them in the style which the first three chapters of the book exhibit. He must have been a preacher and teacher among them, and most intimately acquainted with their circumstances and their condition both spiritual and temporal. He evidently bore a strong attachment to them, like that of a father to his children. He claims authority to rebuke and chasten, also to order discipline and demand reformation. He even insists upon some excommunications. In a word, all which a general and spiritual ἐπίσκοπος or ἐπιστάτης can be supposed to feel, speak, and do, he considers as belonging to himself in relation to the churches of Asia.

Viewing the matter in this light, is it not strange that the *second* John should ever have been thought of as the author of the Apocalypse? He may indeed have been a Hebrew, and possibly well versed in the Hebrew Scriptures. For aught we know, he may have even been a man of some learning also; but where was his authority in all the Asiatic churches? And what do we know of him, from the testimony of antiquity, that distinguishes him from the great mass of common men and common characters, excepting that he was a μαθητὴς Κυρίου, and perhaps one of the seventy disciples; although this last is not very probable? Could a man that was capable of writing the Apocalypse, and who felt free to address the leading churches of hither Asia as the author of the Apocalypse has done, remain in obscurity, and scarcely be

thought of or anywhere mentioned? Things of such a nature are not wont to take place in such a way. On the very face of the whole matter, therefore, it is an improbability that the second John wrote the Apocalypse. One might as well think of attributing Virgil's Aeneis to a Codrus, or the Paradise Lost to Sir Richard Blackmore.

Was there any other John, then, who was conspicuous at an early period in Asia Minor, except John the apostle? We know of none. Dionysius and Eusebius themselves knew of none; for had they known anything of such a person, with their feelings and persuasion respecting the Apocalypse, they would surely have pointed him out. But *somebody must be the author of the book;* some person whose name was *John* must have written it, for it is no book of an impostor. It must have been written at the time when John the apostle was in Asia. The internal evidence, as to time, is conclusive on this point. Who wrote it must have been known to the seven churches. The John who addressed them could be no fictitious personage. How could his book have been received and accredited at all, had such been the fact? John the apostle, at all events, was on the ground when the book was written; and, if it were a forgery, he must have exposed it. Every Christian, at that time and place, must have known which John was banished to Patmos, and of course by which John the churches were addressed. To say the least, moreover, no *obscure* individual could have had the celebrity, which the author of the book must have had in order to free him from the charge of presumption and unbecoming obtrusiveness. All the churches are supposed to know him as it were equally; all to be under obligation to obey him. Had there been any other John than the apostle, in that region, who was in circumstances like these, how is it possible that we should not have heard something more concerning him?

The force of these considerations is greatly increased, by a historical circumstance not yet mentioned. An earlier father than Dionysius of Alexandria was Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who lived in the latter part of Cent. II. An epistle of his to Victor bishop of Rome and to the church there, on the subject of the paschal controversy, is preserved in Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. V. 24. In defence of his own opinion, Polycrates appeals to the like sentiment on the part of the leading and distinguished characters in the church of Asia Minor, viz. to John the apostle, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, etc. But not a word concerning the second John. If such a man had been in authority and had written the Apocalypse, could he have been omitted here? If tradition even, in early times, had ever attributed this book to him, Dionysius and Eusebius would surely not have neglected to tell us so, and Caius and the Alogi would not have resorted to Cerinthus as the author of the

Apocalypse, in order to avoid the credit given to the book by the name of John the apostle.

To all these considerations we may add, that the revelation made to John, (Rev. 1: 1), imports of course that this John was some very conspicuous and distinguished character. Is any other person than an apostle probable? I cannot accede, indeed, to the view which Guerike and others have taken of Rev. 1: 2, as declaring that the John of the Apocalypse is the author of the Gospel which bears the same name. A comparison of this passage with Rev. 1: 9. 6: 9. 20: 4, will show that no sound argument of this nature can be derived from the turn of expression in Rev. 1: 2, for such a purpose. At most, it merely points out the John of the Apocalypse as the preacher or teacher of the word of God and of the Gospel of Christ. What John it was that had borne this character among the seven churches, must have been well known at that time. Besides all this, the Gospel was written *later* than the Apocalypse. Rev. 1: 9 merely defines or further designates the person of the author. That John, the author, was one of the προφῆται, is clear moreover from Rev. 22: 9. Why was anything more than this necessary? To say of himself, that he was *John the beloved disciple*, or *the disciple who leaned on the bosom of Jesus*, or *John the apostle*, was quite superfluous, when writing to the seven churches. All this they must have well known. Nor was John a man who was prone to obtrude on others such claims, when they were not indispensable to some important end.

It strikes me, that any other writer of the Apocalypse than *the John* of that day, unless he was an impostor, would naturally have described himself so as to guard against all mistake. In common honesty he was bound to do this. And when we are asked by any critic with a look of skepticism: Why did not John, if he were the *apostle*, say so? we may well reply: Why did not John the second or presbyter, if indeed he were the author, say who he was, and leave no room for his readers to commit a mistake? As things are, all is well. The author of the book had no suspicion that he would be mistaken for another; and so he took no pains to guard against this. *The John* of Asia Minor was the only man of that day and that region, who was honestly entitled to write in this manner.

Lücke, who generally writes in a spirit of moderation and candour, has, as we have seen above, expressed a most unqualified negative, upon the question of the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse. The same author, however, has admitted fully, that no valid claims can be made out for the second John at Ephesus. He gives up even all pretences to conjecture who the author was. His general conclusion is (p. 390 seq.), that John the apostle may have had the visions related in the Apoca-

lypse; that he probably spoke of them in the circle of the Asiatic churches; that some gifted man there heard him, and undertook to write them down; that in so doing he has mingled his own conceptions with those of John; that the apostle, when he saw the writing, (for he allows that he probably must have seen it), finding that it did not substantially disagree with his own doctrinal views, or with those of Paul, suffered it to circulate without remarks, at least without opposition; and that all this might happen, because, as he avers, the primitive Christians were much more concerned about the *matter* of a writing, viz. whether it was truly Christian or not, than they were respecting the *author* of it. He acknowledges with much candour, that he has no *data* on which to build all this, but he thinks that some such supposition is necessary, in order to reconcile the apparent difficulties that exist as to the composition of the book in question.

But with all due respect for the opinion of so learned and candid a writer, I would ask, whether some of the leading assumptions, in this case, are not opposed to the actual state of things in the early Christian church? In what way, for example, is it to be proved, that the early church did not much concern itself about the *authors* of works on religious topics? How comes it, that amid the flood of very early writings, most of which have perished, only the few New Testament books were selected and fixed upon as genuine? How many of all the New Testament books have other than an apostle for their author? Only Mark and Luke's compositions. But why were these admitted to a place in the Canon? Is not antiquity agreed in the tradition, that the Gospel of Mark was overseen or superintended by Peter, and that of Luke by Paul? As to the Epistles of James and Jude, they were doubtless regarded, by the most of Christians, as the productions of apostolic men. Why was such a line as this drawn, in regard to books on religious topics, unless the churches were solicitous about the *authors*, as well as the matter of them? The history of the New Testament canon speaks loudly against such an assumption as that of Lücke. And if he can point out this Christian father or that, (as he may), who enlarged his own canon beyond our present one, yet it was merely an individual opinion rather than a general one, as the very boundaries or extent of the New Testament canon shows. *Matter of fact*, therefore, stands decidedly against Lücke's assumption.

But if this assumption falls, it brings down his whole building along with it. How could John be indifferent to the setting of his own name to a composition which did not belong to him? Must not a thousand questions have been asked by others of him, in relation to such an extraordinary book? And if he answered them truly, (can we suppose he did not?) then the imposture, or the fiction (if this is a better word),

must have been evident to all. Could the very churches under his own personal care, have been indifferent to the use of his name, in such a case? Specially could those churches have acquiesced, who are severely rebuked in the Apocalypse? Then, moreover, what honest and decent man would have ventured upon such a bold experiment under the very eye of the apostle himself? What could he expect for his book which made pretences so lofty, when all of them could be exposed by a single word from John? Why, if he reduced to writing John's representations of his visions at Patmos—why did he not submit the composition to John, and tell his readers that he had done so? A most adventurous task he undertook, full surely, viz. to 'mix the apostle's conceptions with his own,' in relation to such subjects as are here treated of. But no—this is quite improbable, if not indeed altogether impossible. If such had been the case, the style of the composition must have betrayed the hand of the fictitious writer. It is out of question, that any writer should so commingle his own with that of another, in such a book of high wrought poetry as the Apocalypse, and yet not betray any diversity in plan or style. Yet in all the Bible there is not a book that is more uniform in style, or more compacted and dove-tailed together than the Apocalypse. I doubt whether there is one, of the same length, which does not exhibit more diversity of style than this book. Such are its idiomatic peculiarities, that even the *disjecta membra* bear the stamp of the main body. If there ever was a book that had but one author, the Apocalypse has an irresistible claim to be considered as such a book.

Then how comes it, that neither a Dionysius, nor a Caius, nor a Eusebius, was able to find out anything respecting such a fiction? Would not the Alogi, too, have hunted it out? How comes it that the great mass of ancient Christian fathers speak and think of John the apostle only as the author of the Apocalypse, (we shall see this to be the fact), and how can it be, that no report of a composition of the book like that supposed by Lücke, or by Dionysius, ever had any currency in ancient times? In short, in whatever direction we turn, objections start up as thick and as menacing, as the armed men from the teeth which were sown by Cadmus. Sooner would I embrace the hypothesis, that either John Mark, or John the presbyter, was the author, than believe such a fiction as Lücke proposes. How could all this take place, under the very eye of the apostle John, and among the Christians specially committed to his care?

One word on the idea of an *impostor's* having composed the book; for more than a word is not needed. If there be any book in all the Scriptures, which bears unequivocal marks of a most serious and earnest state of mind, the Apocalypse must be regarded as such a book,

by every impartial and feeling reader. A deeper tone of earnestness never pervaded any writing. What could an *impostor* have in view, by composing such a book? How could he expect the Asiatic Christians to receive it? How could he suppose, that John would not at once overthrow its credit? Was it fame that the impostor courted? How could he obtain it, where detection of his imposture was certain? Was it personal honour or gain that he sought for? How could he obtain either, so long as he kept himself concealed and was unknown? In fact, the allegation of imposture may be made, for it has been, by heated and indiscreet disputants; but it is not deserving of any special notice. The spirit—the all pervading Christian spirit of the Apocalypse, is a sufficient answer to any allegation of this kind that can be made.

Finally, it lies upon the face of this whole matter, that whoever in fact wrote the book, he meant to attribute it to the apostle John. Dionysius and Eusebius excepted, the ancients thought and spoke of no other John, in relation to the Apocalypse. Even Dionysius, however, with all his feeling of opposition to Chiliasm, which was mainly grounded by its advocates on the Apocalypse, did not venture even to suggest, that tradition had ascribed the work to John the presbyter. It is merely a *conjecture* of his own, built on the testimony of Papias respecting a second John at Ephesus. Eusebius, as we have seen, merely repeats his conjecture; and this, too, without even putting so much stress upon it as Dionysius does. The question, then, as it respects the assertions of the Apocalypse itself concerning *John* as its author, is reduced to narrow limits. It is simply this: Is any other John, except the apostle, likely to have written and published such a book as the Apocalypse, at the time and place in which it was published, and under the circumstances that must have attended the publication? And the answer to this question may well be submitted to the judgment of every impartial critic, who is well informed in matters of Christian antiquity. There is, indeed, no work of antiquity about which doubts may not be raised and suggested. The Iliad, the Eneid, and nearly all the classical writings of Greece and Rome, have been assailed by doubts; and many of these, moreover, are not lacking as to zeal or ingenuity. But these writings still hold their place. If the Apocalypse has not a similar right to claim John as its author, it is not because its own declarations or external testimony are wanting.

(2) Testimony of Polycarp.

That Polycarp was in part contemporary with the apostle John, and that he was constituted a bishop of Smyrna by him or by some of the apostles, is generally conceded, and is directly testified by Irenaeus, a disciple of his, in his book Contra Haer. III. 4. See also the same in

Euseb. IV. 14. The celebrity of his character needs no illustration here. The time of his martyrdom and death is not certain. The Chronicon Paschale names 163; Eusebius 167, Usher 169, and Pearson 147. The last seems in some respects to be the more probable date, inasmuch as eighty-six (the age at which he suffered martyrdom), would make him to be only thirty-two years in A. D. 98, when John probably died; while the other dates would make him less than twenty. If he was made bishop by John, it is hardly probable that he could have been much younger than thirty-two.

We have only one relic of his writings still extant, viz. his epistle to the Philippians. Besides this, we have (in Euseb. IV. 15) an epistle of the church at Smyrna to the churches in Pontus, giving a copious narration of the martyrdom of Polycarp. In these there is no allusion to the Apocalypse. But nothing for or against the Apocalypse as a work of John, or as existing at all, can be drawn from this circumstance. All that is necessary to be said, is, that Polycarp, or his friends, had no occasion to speak of the Apocalypse, in their communications still extant. Is it any good argument against the existence of this or that Old Testament book and its canonical authority, that Paul or Peter, James or John, has not quoted it in their epistles?

Meanwhile many of the friends of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse have urged the *indirect* testimony of Polycarp to such an origin, in the following manner: 'As Polycarp was the personal friend and attendant of John, so was Irenaeus of Polycarp. Now Irenaeus, every where and on all occasions, testifies his full belief in the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. Could he have done so, if Polycarp had not believed the same? And must not Polycarp have certainly known what was the fact, in regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse?'

All this, to say the least, looks probable and natural. One can indeed scarcely conceive of a persuasion, so deep and radical as that of Irenaeus certainly was, and yet suppose that Polycarp doubted the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. In his remarks on Rev. 13: 18 (the number of the beast), Irenaeus speaks of the testimony to the reading χξς as being delivered by *ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων*, Lib. V. 30. 1. Is not Polycarp included among these? And if not, does not the testimony necessarily imply, that some of the personal acquaintances of John had ascertained *from him*, what the reading in question was, and had told Irenaeus? And why *from him*? Plainly, as the direct implication is, because he, being the author of the book, could speak with certainty. There is no other probable ground for making such an appeal. And it is difficult to resist the impression from all this, that Polycarp believed and asserted the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; although this does not, and cannot, amount to a certainty.

Yet whoever reads the extract from Irenaeus' epistle to Florinus, (in Euseb. V. 20), will be so deeply impressed with the enthusiastic reverence of Irenaeus for Polycarp, that he can scarcely suppose the latter to have disbelieved the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, while the former so often and so strongly asserts it. To conclude with Lücke, that because Irenaeus has erred in regard to the *time* in which the Apocalypse was written, he might also err as to the *author* of the book, seems not to be satisfactory. The *possibility*, indeed, who will deny? But still, the two cases are far from being alike. Two persecutions of Christians took place during the life of John. Under both banishment took place. The persecutions happened a century or more before Irenaeus wrote his book. It is quite probable, that, being a youth (*παῖς ὤν*), he did not make special inquiry respecting the *time*, when the book was written. The persecution of Domitian he was best acquainted with. The internal evidence of the book against a late composition, he had not studied or learned to appreciate. John, it may be and is even probable, suffered a second banishment. But be this as it may, it seems quite probable, that Irenaeus made out his opinion respecting the *date* of the Apocalypse, from what is contained in Rev. 1: 9, and not from testimony. If indeed he made out his opinion about the *author* in the same way, this would only serve to show what impression the declaration of the Apocalypse concerning John had made on the churches. The question of *authorship*, on which, as the ancients viewed the subject, was suspended the credit of the book, is in its very nature different from the question respecting *time*. In circumstances like these, the natural impression on the whole is, that Polycarp's belief was like that of Irenaeus, in respect to the Apocalypse. Is it probable that the latter would venture, on such a point, to differ from the former? Is it probable that he did not know the opinion of the former, in respect to the authorship of the Apocalypse?

(3) Testimony of Papias.

On this subject it is unnecessary for me to dwell very long. I have already examined the question, whether Papias was probably a hearer of John, or of any of the apostles. Irenaeus directly asserts that he was, in Haeres. V. 33; Eusebius, in III. 39 reasons against it, as we have seen (p. 290 seq. above), from the words of Papias himself. But is it not evident, that Eusebius' exegesis is faulty? He had strong prejudices against Papias as a Millenarian, and looked upon him as an enthusiast. Be it that he was right in his opinion, so far as this point was concerned, this does not establish the correctness of his exegesis. And other sources of knowledge, which would show that Papias was not a hearer of John, he does not pretend to have. With Irenaeus the case

seems to be different. That Papias was the intimate friend (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp, is asserted by Irenaeus in V. 33, and admitted by Eusebius in Ecc. Hist. III. 39. Is it probable, then, that Irenaeus, the enthusiastic admirer of Polycarp, was mistaken on a point so plain and obvious as this, viz., whether Papias, the intimate friend of Polycarp, was acquainted with John, with whom, it is admitted, Polycarp himself was familiar? I cannot well conceive, that Irenaeus' testimony in this case does not outweigh the mere constructive argument which Eusebius has drawn from the text of a passage in Papias. Jerome, who was no Millenarian, does not reason in this way. Although in his Catalogus (s. v. Papias), he translates the very passage of Papias on which Eusebius builds his argument, still he says: "Papias, *Johannis auditor*, Hieropolitanus in Asia episcopus." He repeats this in his Ep. ad Theodoram, (IV. p. 581), where he says: "Refert Irenaeus . . . et Papiae auditoris evangelistae Johannis discipulus, etc." That Irenaeus was a *disciple of Papias*, and the latter a hearer of John, is here asserted by Jerome. Whence he obtained it, i. e. whether by report or inference from written testimonies, I know not. I do not find this circumstance elsewhere mentioned; but, considering the intimacy between Polycarp and Papias, the assertion of Jerome seems quite probable.

Thus much for the personal relations of Papias. Now as to his *testimony*. We have already seen, that the passage in Euseb. III. 39 does itself contain an intimation, that Papias was a personal inquirer of the apostles, p. 291 seq. above. We have extracts from the λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις of this writer, in Eusebius, in Irenaeus, in Jerome, and in the Commentary of Andreas bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (Cent. V.); so that there can be no doubt of Papias' work being well known anciently, and long circulated. But none of these extracts speak directly to the point of John's authorship. Yet it is most abundantly evident, that Papias was a warm defender, if not the father, of the Millenarian doctrine of the early ages. On what did he build this? Whence did such views originate? Semler, Corrodi, and others, have said, that it originated from earlier Rabbinic speculation and phantasies still circulating among the converted Jews; and Corrodi has laboured with great skill and ingenuity to prove this. But what is the evidence? I do not find anything more than surmises, which are built upon productions subsequent to the origin of the Apocalypse. Irenaeus, in the very passage which he cites from Papias respecting the millennial period (V. 33), speaks of him as "having seen John the disciple of the Lord." How can we understand him as meaning to imply less, than that Papias claimed the sanction of John for his view of the Millennium? I do not say that he has, or makes, any claim to the personal sanction of John in conversation, but to the authority of John as exhibited in the Apocalypse.

If now it can be shown, that Papias was acquainted with the Apocalypse, and regarded it as a divine book, it would seem sufficiently probable, that he drew his Chiliasm from that book. The commentaries of Andreas, and of his successor Arethas, make this sufficiently sure; as we shall see in the sequel. But in the mean time, it seems to me altogether probable, that Eusebius himself has given the same opinion. In Ecc. Hist. III. 39, he says: "Even this same writer [Papias] sets forth things as coming to him from unwritten tradition, viz. certain strange parables [i. e. such as are not contained in the Gospels] of the Saviour, and doctrines of his, and certain other fabulous things. Among these he also declares, that there will be a certain Chiliad of years after the resurrection from the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be established visibly [*σωματικῶς*, *bodily*, i. e. materially] on this earth. *Ἃ καὶ ἡγοῦμαι, τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παραδεξάμενον διηγήσεις, ὑπολαβεῖν, τὰ ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρημένα μὴ συνεωρακότα. Σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων τεκμηράμενον εἰπεῖν, φαίνεται*, i. e. which [Chiliad and earthly kingdom] I suppose he admitted, because he misunderstood the *apostolic διηγήσεις*, not perceiving that the things declared in the documents [copies of the Scriptures] were mystically spoken by them [by the apostles]. For he appears to have been a man of very moderate capacity, as one might affirm from the testimony of his own words." Eusebius then adds: "Still he appears to have been the cause of the like opinion among most ecclesiastics, who allege the great antiquity of the man." Now in this passage, Eusebius distinguishes two sources of Papias' opinions, the one is *unwritten tradition*, and the other is *apostolical διηγήσεις*. From this latter source comes Papias' view of the Millennium. But how? By interpreting *literally* what is said *μυστικῶς*. Where else but in the Apocalypse did Papias find *διηγήσεις* of this nature, limiting the period to a Chiliad of years? Plainly nowhere. But observe that Eusebius says, at the same time, that the *διηγήσεις* from which Papias drew his Millennial views, were *ἀποστολικάς*. If so, then Papias looked upon the Apocalypse as the work of John the apostle; for it is not even pretended that any other apostle was ever thought of by the ancients as the author of the Apocalypse.

So far as it respects our present view of Papias's testimony, it matters not whether he had been a hearer of John or not. I should prefer to believe, if I could make it consistent with what Irenaeus says, that he was not; for how could he get such views of the Millennium as he has developed, from intercourse with the apostle himself? But that Eusebius himself means to concede, that he drew them from writings regarded by Papias as apostolical, although he did this by a wrong exegesis, seems to lie upon the face of the above passage. Did not Papias, then, regard the Apocalypse as an apostolical book?

But he was *σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν*. True, such was the judgment of Eusebius; but in what respect? Only as it regarded the interpretation of the figurative language of prophecy, Eusebius himself being judge. In III. 36 he says: "Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, *ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος, καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων*; i. e. a man in all respects most learned [or eloquent], and skilled in the Scriptures." Valesius, indeed, in a note on this passage, says that several Mss. of Eusebius omit this latter clause. But this savours of emendation. The clause looks like a contradiction of what is said afterwards in III. 39, as quoted above; and Papias was in no good odour with the Antimillenarians. Yet in reality there is no contradiction, as viewed by Eusebius. He denies to Papias the talent requisite to interpret the mystical prophecies in an appropriate manner, because he interprets them *literally* or *σωματικῶς*. And with good reason. Yet he might be a man of many other attainments, and most probably was. How else can the influence which Eusebius himself ascribes to him be well accounted for?

Thus much for Eusebius's view of Papias and his opinions. At a later period we find testimony still more explicit. The book of Papias survived the 5th century, and probably a considerably longer period. Near the close of this century, however, Andreas, bishop of Caesarea, wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, which is still extant. In the Preface to this he says: *Περὶ μέντοι τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττὸν μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον ἡγούμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων, Γρηγορίου φημί τοῦ θεολόγου, καί Κυρίλλου, προσέτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων, Παππίου, Εἰρηναίου, Μεθοδίου καὶ Ἱππολύτου ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον*; i. e. 'in regard now to the inspiration of the book, we think it superfluous to extend our discourse, inasmuch as the blessed, Gregory the *θεόλογος* I mean, and Cyril, and moreover the more ancient [writers], Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, bear testimony to the credibility of this [book].' In nearly the same words throughout, does Arethas, the successor of Andreas, (fl. in the early part of Cent. VI.), bear the like testimony. It is evident that both commentators possessed and consulted the *Λογίων κυριακῶν Ἐξηγήσεις* of Papias.

The credibility of these witnesses no one will pretend to impeach. Particularly as it respects Papias; it is evident that they had no *millenarian* sympathy with him, and were not led by partiality in this respect to appeal to him; for both of them (Comm. on Rev. xx.) reject all carnal views of the Millennium. That Andreas actually made use of the work of Papias, is clear from the fact, that he appeals to Papias by name, and cites two distinct passages from him, in his Commentary on Rev. 12: 7. It does not follow, that he cites from a *Commentary* of Papias on the Apocalypse; for, although such a work has been ascribed to him by some, yet neither Eusebius, nor any of the ancient writers

appeal to any such production of Papias. The passages cited concern merely the agency of angels, and may well have been in the book of Papias already named.

What then is it to which Papias bears witness, in the view of Andreas and Arethas? It is the *θεόπνευστον* of the Apocalypse, i. e. its *inspiration*. But in the view of these commentators throughout, who has any claim to be the author of an *inspired* book? Plainly none but apostles, and those who wrote under their eye, and as it were by their dictation. Lücke apparently concedes this, p. 270; and yet afterwards he seems to take it back, p. 271. At least, he thinks it quite possible, that Papias, although he knew the book was not of apostolic origin, might still have regarded it as inspired. But if Papias's account of himself, given on p. 290 seq. above, is correct, it would seem very plain, that he cared little for any traditions or *διηγήσεις* which did not come from the apostles. Even Aristion and the presbyter John are appealed to only as reporters of *apostolic* sayings; at least, the proper exegesis of Papias so decides the matter. This makes against the view of Lücke. It looks much as if Papias did not credit even *διηγήσεις* or *παραδόσεις*, unless he could trace them to an apostolic origin. Deceived he might have been, and doubtless was, as to the origin of some of his *ἐξηγήσεις*; but the *principle* of reception remained steadfast. How can it be said, then, with any good degree of probability, that Papias might easily admit the *inspiration* of the Apocalypse, although he did not hold the book to be *apostolic*? If he insisted on such authority even for his *ἐξηγήσεις*, would he be satisfied with less for a book of divine authority? Will Lücke tell us how—with such a facile faith as he ascribes to Papias and the age in which he lived—how it came about that the New Testament should be made up, at last, only of *apostolic* writings—apostolic in the immediate and proper sense, or in an equivalent one? This fact makes against his view of Papias' facile faith. Mistaken Papias might be, in a matter of criticism and taste; but if he was—as Irenaeus and Jerome assert, and as the time and circumstances in which he lived go to show—a hearer of John and an intimate friend of Polycarp, (yea, and a teacher of Irenaeus also), how could he well mistake about a point of so deep interest to him as a Millenarian, viz. Who wrote the Apocalypse? The supposition seems not to be entitled to credit, when all these circumstances are fully weighed.

'But,' it is alleged, 'Andreas was mistaken as to the belief of Gregory [of Nazianzen] and Cyril [of Alexandria] in the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. Why may he not have been mistaken, also, in his opinion respecting Papias?' The possibility of this, no one will deny; the *probability* is another question. But that he was mistaken as to Cyril, is far from being correct; and that Gregory Nazianzen rejected

the Apocalypse, is a proposition which cannot well be established, as we shall see in due time. As to Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, there can be no doubt that Andreas is in the right. The views which he ascribes to Papias, then, stand fairly unimpeached.

'But how could Eusebius have passed over such an acknowledgment, on the part of Papias, of the authority of the Apocalypse, when he so carefully cites his testimony, and that of others, to the other books of the New Testament? Eusebius must surely have read him, in order to obtain his testimony in general; and why has he failed to report it on this point?'

That Eusebius read the work of Papias, I am not about to deny. But Eusebius had a strong dislike of everything that pertained to Chiliasm, and a strong distaste for Papias' visionary turn of mind. That he read him with a less scrutinizing eye, in such passages as pertained to Chiliasm, it is not unnatural to suppose, because of his distaste for them. At all events, we may ask questions equally difficult to be answered on the other side, viz., How could *Irenaeus* have so mistaken the character of Papias, and his relation to Polycarp and to John? How could Jerome have so mistaken the same? How could Andreas and Arethas, who appeal to Papias, and evidently had his work in their hands, have so mistaken his views? It is much easier to suppose, that Eusebius committed some oversight in this matter, than it is to dispose of all this testimony, and of all the probabilities that arise from the time, place, and circumstances, in which Papias lived.

On the whole, if certainty is not attained here, reasonable probability, and that in no small degree, seems to be the result of our investigation. I must think that the staunch Millenarian, Papias, drew his views from a defective interpretation of the Apocalypse, and that in resorting to it for those views, he regarded it as the work of John, and as being of apostolical authority. Nor can I think, that Eusebius and the other writers named above contradict each other, as to testimony about matters of fact. The former made up his opinion merely from his interpretation of a passage in Papias, and, as we have reason to believe, made it up erroneously; the latter either drew from other sources, or else took a different and more correct view of the meaning of Papias. In this case, their exegesis would be discrepant from that of Eusebius; but the testimony of the two parties as to *facts*, does *not* stand in mutual opposition.

(4) Testimony of Justin Martyr.

This father was born at Neapolis or Sichem in Samaria; was of Greek origin; was in part contemporary with Polycarp and Papias, and flourished as a writer about 140—160. He was first a heathen phi-

losopher; and after his conversion to Christianity, about 132, he travelled in Egypt, Italy, and Asia Minor. Ephesus, among other places, was his abode for some time. Endowed with a bold and inquiring mind, it could scarcely be supposed, that he would not make inquiries there respecting the life and works of the apostle John. Eusebius avers, that the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* was held at Ephesus; by which he seems to suppose, that the work of Justin, so entitled, is only a narrative of what actually took place. The authenticity of this work was some time since called in question, by the effervescence of skeptical criticism. But Muenscher's defence of it has set the question at rest. If it had not, the recent discussion of Semisch must do so. The work of Justin was written about 140; and therefore during the life of Polycarp, Papias, and Irenaeus.

Justin is labouring (c. 80, 81) to establish the doctrine of *Chiliasm;* to which he seems to have been a real convert. After citing various passages in confirmation of it from the Jewish Scriptures, he appeals to the testimony of New Testament Scriptures in the following words: "*Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ, χίλια ἔτη ποιήσειν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντες προεφήτευσε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ (συνελόντι φάναι) αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν*· i. e. Moreover, since even among us a certain man, John by name, one of the apostles of Christ, in the Revelation made to him, prophesied that those who believe in our Messiah should spend a thousand years in Jerusalem, and after this (to speak briefly) that there should be a general and perpetual resurrection and judgment of all at the same time." That Justin, however, did not regard this Chiliad as one of mere worldly pleasure, is clear from the sequel, in which he goes on to show, that the declaration of Christ, (Luke 20: 35, 36), viz., 'In the resurrection, they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but be like the angels,' confirms the account in the Apocalypse.

That John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, and that this is a book of divine authority or inspired, lies upon the very face of this declaration too obviously to need any comment.

That those who impugn the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, should endeavour to do away the force of such a pointed and seemingly irresistible testimony as this, was to be expected. Accordingly, from the time of Abauzit downwards, there have not been wanting men, who remind us of the enthusiam and credulity of Justin—of his belief in fables, in the wonderful rise of the Septuagint version, and the like; moreover, of his spiritualizing exegesis, etc. To all this, however, there is one plain and simple answer: A man may be an erroneous interpret-

er of the words of Scripture, or credulous as to alleged wonders, while his testimony to a simple *fact*, which has nothing of the wonderful in it, may be very upright and worthy of all credit. That John the apostle, and not some other man, wrote the book of Revelation, has nothing of the wonderful in it. It would be much more wonderful, if any other man of that day and in Asia Minor wrote it; for there are things in it, which would seem strange if attributed to any other man than such an one as the apostle. All such objections, then, on the part of Abauzit, Oeder, Semler, and their followers, we may dismiss, without an effort to refute them.

Attempts of a different nature, less disingenuous, but in my apprehension not more successful, have recently been made in order to rebut the testimony of Justin. Rettig has denied the *genuineness* of the clause, *εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; Ueber die Zeugniss für die Aechtheit, etc. Leip. 1829. On what ground? No Mss. omit it. The passage was in Justin, when Eusebius wrote his Ecc. History. In IV. 18 Eusebius says, in so many words: "He [Justin] mentions the Apocalypse of John, and says expressly (*σαφῶς*), that it belongs to the apostle." Eusebius then goes on to show in what high credit Justin's work stood among the early Christians. That the phrase in question was ever wanting in Justin, there is not the slightest evidence. Rettig says, indeed, that the *strangeness* of the phraseology renders it altogether suspicious. But the force of this remark I do not feel. Justin is speaking to a Jew; to one unacquainted, as it would seem, with the books of Christians; else why should he detail to him the whole compass, as it were, of the evangelical history? Justin had been appealing to Old Testament passages. He now makes the transition to a part of the New Testament. In so doing he says: "A certain man among us [Christians], John by name, *one of the apostles of Christ*, prophesied, etc." Justin means to say, that the prophecy now to be cited came from an authentic source, and therefore he says: *One of the apostles of Christ.* Why is this any more strange than the clause: "There was a man sent from God, John by name, etc." in John 1: 5? In speaking to Trypho of Peter, Justin (c. 108) says: "He [Christ] named one of his disciples *Peter*, who was formerly called Simon." Is not this of the same tenor with the other passages? In fact, all is so natural here, that not to suppose some such mode of address would be strange. Accordingly Rettig has found few, if any, who sympathize with him in this matter. Schott, Lücke, Credner, all decide against him.

But Lücke comes to a conclusion respecting Justin's testimony, which would seem to deprive it mainly of any value. 'Justin,' he says, 'was not a disciple of the apostle, or of apostolical men like Polycarp

and others. We do not know, (he further says), that he made inquiry of any of them, therefore, in respect to the authorship of the Apocalypse; and it does not follow, because he was in Ephesus, that he there made any investigations respecting this matter. He might have drawn his inferences about authorship, then, from the book itself, and so his testimony would merely depend on his exegetical conclusions, and therefore could not be decisive.'

One could hardly expect this strain of reasoning from such a writer as Lücke. Elsewhere, and in regard to other books, the testimony of the fathers respecting them rests on two grounds; (1) Direct quotation of them as sacred books. (2) Allegations that they were written by this or that individual. Sometimes tradition is appealed to in these cases, and sometimes it is not. The very nature of the case decides, that it must always be implied; for on what else can the opinion of writers after about A. D. 160 rest, except on such a basis? Now in the case before us, Justin unites for substance both of these modes of appeal. He cites as authoritative the matter of a passage in the Apocalypse; and he states the fact, that the Revelation was made to John the apostle, and that he uttered it, *προεφήτευσε*. And is it rational to suppose, that such an inquiring and enthusiastic mind as Justin's, while he was at Ephesus, would have remained idle and indifferent to the question: Who wrote the Apocalypse? Above all, since Justin was a *Chiliast*, would he have remained indifferent to the inquiry: Whether the Apocalypse, in his view the principal support of Chiliasm, was a book on which reliance might be placed? His Chiliasm would of itself have given him a more than usual interest in this question. And at Ephesus, and not long after John's death too, when many who had been personally acquainted with him, must have been still living, he had all possible opportunity for inquiry of the most direct and decisive nature. Is there any ground for such a turn as Lücke gives to this matter? If there is, then all the testimony of antiquity can be rendered suspicious, or be virtually annulled. On every ground, whether that of intelligence, of the spirit of inquiry, of credibility as to matters within his reach, and of opportunity in the case before us, Justin stands fast as an unimpeachable and credible witness.

One singular circumstance in respect to Justin should be noticed here, before we proceed to other testimony. It has been supposed by many, that he wrote a *Commentary* on the Apocalypse. This is founded on a strange clause, which appears in Jerome's Catalogus, (c. 9): "In the 14th year of Domitian, who, after Nero, carried on the second persecution, John, being banished to the isle of Patmos, wrote the Apocalypse; *quam interpretantur Justinus Martyr et Irenaeus.*" The same Jerome, in his Chronicon says: *Quam Irenaeus interpretatur.* But in his Cat-

alogus, under the titles *Justin* and *Irenaeus*, he makes mention of no such work as executed by either of these fathers. None was known to the ancients; at least, no mention is made of any such. The manuscripts give us no aid in getting rid of the clause in question; and many conjectures have been made in respect to its meaning. I cannot help believing, with Lücke, that the original Greek in Eusebius' Chronicon, from which Jerome drew in writing his own Chronicon, affords an adequate solution of the matter. Eusebius is speaking of John's visions being seen at Patmos; and he adds: ὡς δηλοῖ Εἰρηναῖος, *as Irenaeus shows* or *testifies*. In some moment of haste or oversight, as it would seem, Jerome rendered δηλοῖ by *interpretatur*. This done, the *quam* was adopted of course, instead of *ut* = the ὡς of Eusebius. Sophronius, the Greek interpreter of Jerome, (see in edit. Fabr.), has translated Jerome's *interpretatur* by μετέφρασε, i. e. *metaphrased*. What this means here, it would be difficult to say. It is evident that no investigation of the matter itself was made, either by Jerome or Sophronius. The error once committed in the Chronicon, is transferred to the Catalogus, where *Justin*, as well as Irenaeus, is said to be an *interpreter* of the Apocalypse. It is a pity, that so many theories about Justin's Commentary on the Apocalypse should have been made from such materials. But all this has no immediate relation to the *testimony* of Justin.

That this father has, in his writings now extant, appealed to the Apocalypse but once, need not seem strange. It is enough to suggest, that he found no occasion to do so more than once. There are other books of Scripture to which he has not appealed at all; but this makes nothing against them. Justin seldom appeals directly to New Testament books, except where he wishes to illustrate something in the history of Christ or the apostles; and then, he rarely appeals to them by name. The Apocalypse, from its very nature, had little to do with the subject of his Apologies or of his Dialogue.

On the whole, even if we allow any weight to the suggestions of Lücke concerning the uncertain value of Justin's testimony, it must be conceded at all events, that Justin believed the Apocalypse to be the apostle John's work, because common report so represented it. Can common report, now, on this subject among Christians at Ephesus, and so short a time after the death of John, leave us any good room for doubt as to its correctness? And how can we even suppose that Justin was not acquainted with it?

(5) Testimony of Melito bishop of Sardis.

Melito was a contemporary of Justin, and bishop of one of the churches to which one of the apocalyptic epistles is addressed. He was a man greatly distinguished for learning and piety; so much so, that Ter-

tullian, as Jerome asserts (Catal. 24), says, that Christians were wont to name him a *prophet*. He was, moreover, unusually inquisitive respecting the sacred books. At the request of Onesimus, he made extracts from the Scriptures respecting the Messianic prophecies; he also made out, for the same individual, a complete list of the Old Testament canon, which is still extant in Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. IV. 26. The testimony of such a man respecting the Apocalypse, is not only very desirable, but, if accessible, must be of great weight.

He has given, however, no list of the New Testament writings; for in his time, they were scarcely brought into one combined volume. Eusebius, after mentioning the titles of various books which Melito had written, adds to these the following declaration: *καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου*, 4: 26. Critics are not agreed, whether this is the title of one book or of two. In the meantime, Jerome (Catal. 24) clearly understands the passage as the title of *two* books; for he renders it thus: "De diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Joannis librum unum." Had Eusebius repeated *περί* before the latter clause of his expression, it would have clearly meant what Jerome supposes it to mean. But Jerome may have seen the books themselves, and thus obtained a certain knowledge.

In the meantime, whether two books or one be meant, the substance of the testimony is the same. Now as Eusebius, who doubted whether the Apocalypse was an apostolic work, was always on the watch for anything which might sustain his doubts, it cannot be reasonably supposed that the John here named was, in his view, any other than John the apostle. Had there fairly been room for a surmise that John the presbyter was meant, he would surely not have failed to note it, for it would have been quite sufficient to sustain his doubts. The voice of nearly all antiquity, which never speaks of any other John than the apostle, is entirely against John the presbyter here; and this Eusebius has candidly admitted, by his silence in respect to the subject.

Melito, then, a learned, curious, and critical inquirer, bishop of one of the churches addressed in the Apocalypse, and belonging to the next generation after the apostle John, wrote a commentary, or at least a treatise, on the Apocalypse. Would he have done this, if he had not regarded the book as genuine, apostolic, and inspired? The probability is against such a supposition.

(6) Testimony of Theophilus bishop of Antioch.

This writer flourished about 169—180. Some of his writings still remain, viz. Libri III. ad Autolycum. He appears to have been a man of some distinction. "He wrote a book," says Eusebius (Ecc. Hist. IV. 24), "against the heresy of Hermogenes, *ἐν ᾧ ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύ-*

ψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις. I need not repeat the remarks already made on the nature of such an appeal. That John the apostle is here meant, and that the testimony of the Apocalypse was cited by Theophilus as Scripture, is quite plain, and was doubtless felt to be so by Eusebius; who certainly reports the matter with great ingenuousness.

A passage in the *ad Autol.* II. 28, *δαίμων δὲ καὶ δράκων καλεῖται*, viz. Satan, has been supposed to refer to Rev. 12: 9. It may be so; but the imitation is not exact enough to render it certain.

(7) Testimony of Apollonius.

This person was a distinguished writer of Asia Minor, near the close of Cent. II. He wrote a book against the Montanists, from which Eusebius makes long extracts, Ecc. Hist. V. 18. This historian also notes concerning Apollonius and his book: *Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως*, i. e. 'he employs testimony from the Apocalypse of John.' What John is meant, is shown by the next clause: "And he relates that a dead person was raised by this same John, through divine power." The apostolic power of working miracles is hereby plainly supposed. Eusebius evidently thinks of no other John than the apostle.

(8) Testimony of Irenaeus bishop of Lyons.

Irenaeus was among the most renowned of the early fathers, on account of his learning, his steadfastness, and his zeal for the truth. He appears to have been born not far from the beginning of Cent. II., probably at Smyrna; and when a youth (*παῖς ὤν—ἐν πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ*, Euseb. V. 20. Iren. Cont. Haer. III. 3), he was a hearer of Polycarp, and, as Jerome avers (epist. ad Theodoram), also a disciple of Papias. It is not improbable that he went to Rome with Polycarp, who went thither in order to compose the Easter controversy when Anicetus was bishop of that city. We find him afterwards at Lyons in France, first a presbyter, and then a bishop after the death of Pothinus. *When* or *why* this transfer of abode took place, we have no certain means of determining. It must have been when he was about seventy years of age, that he became a bishop. He wrote his great work, *Contra Haereses*, after this. His martyrdom in extreme old age has been asserted; but the writers of Cent. III. do not appear to have any knowledge of such an event.

The importance of his testimony needs no illustration; and this testimony we have in sufficient abundance. I will give some leading passages, which will serve at once to explain and confirm the others; after

which I shall merely give references to other passages, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition of the same views.

In Cont. Haeres. IV. 20. 11, he cites at length Rev. 1: 12—16, and prefaces it by saying: "Joannes Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi sacerdotalem et gloriosum regni ejus videns adventum, inquit," etc. In V. 26 he says: "Significavit Joannes Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi, etc." quoting Rev. 17: 12 seq. The same in IV. 30. 4. The like in IV. 21: 3. V. 35. 2. V. 36. 3. In V. 30, the whole strain of argument and representation is based upon the idea, that John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse. In Euseb. V. 8 and III. 18, there is a full recognition of some of these testimonies. And that no other John, than the author of the Gospel, is the *μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου* who is so often mentioned by Irenaeus, none can doubt, who are familiar with the writings of this father. Of any other John than this, in the apostolic ages, he knows, or at least says, nothing. And although he never speaks of John by calling him the *evangelist* or *apostle*, but names him *John the disciple* or simply *John;* yet he has given us the key to unlock his meaning in these cases with certainty; for in III. 1, he says: "Postea Johannes, discipulus Domini, et ipse edidit Evangelium." In V. 30 is a passage, before adverted to, which speaks too plainly to be misunderstood. Irenaeus introduces the passage respecting the number of the beast, which is found in Rev. 13: 18. Instead of 666, he says that some copies of his time read 616. 'The former,' he goes on to say, 'is found *ἐν πᾶσι σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις*, i. e. in all correct and ancient Codices.' It follows, then, that in the very next generation after the death of John, a difference of copies had already taken place in regard to this number, and that one class of Mss. had already become *ancient*, in the estimation of Irenaeus. This shows, then, not only the circulation of the Apocalypse among the churches, but its very early circulation; and, if the Mss. of the Apocalypse in Irenaeus' neighborhood be here meant, it shows its wide circulation. Nor is this all. Irenaeus tells how the true reading may be still further ascertained: *Μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων*, i. e. 'Those very persons bear testimony to it, who have seen John face to face.' What John? A subsequent passage (§ 3) tells us: "For if it [the name of the beast] ought to be openly declared at the present time, *δἰ ἐκείνου ἂν ἐῤῥέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος*, i. e. then it would have been spoken by him who saw the Apocalypse." The John in question, then, is he who saw the apocalyptic vision, who, as he has spoken out other things in his book, would have spoken out the mysterious name in question, if it had been proper to do so; and this is the same John who was seen by those that bore testimony to the correct reading, i. e. 666. This concatenation is inevitable; and it set-

tles the question, who wrote the Apocalypse, so far as the opinion of Irenaeus is concerned.

Lücke, however, finds two difficulties in respect to the testimony of Irenaeus; 'first, we do not know on what grounds this father formed his opinion, i. e. whether he merely followed the current supposition of the day, that the apostle John wrote the book, or whether he made inquiry of such men as Polycarp and Papias; and secondly, Irenaeus has erred in respect to the *time* when the book was written, and why may he not have erred, too, as to its author?' But does not Irenaeus, in the passage just cited above, show that he had not been negligent in appealing to the personal acquaintances of John? Does not the nature of the case speak for itself, when he tells us with what enthusiasm he heard Polycarp, in his youth, and how deeply every word he said was engraven upon his memory? See in Euseb. V. 20. How could a man capable of writing the *Contra Haereses*, have been so grossly negligent of his opportunities of acquiring information? I know well, indeed, that all this is *possible;* but is it probable? Does it accord well with what we know of Irenaeus? And if the testimony to other books of the New Testament is to be scanned by such rules as are applied to this case, is there a single book which can stand? Not one. Should we not do now in the present case, what we must justify in other cases? And if so, we need not ask for any more.

As to the second allegation of Lücke, viz. that Irenaeus has erred respecting the *time* when the Apocalypse was written, and so is not to be looked upon as a trust-worthy witness; one might reply in Lücke's own words, when he is defending the passage in Justin, cited above, from the like assault: "Whoever errs once, or even many times, does not therefore err always, and at all times," p. 277. But setting aside this just remark, some other considerations deserve our notice. I have already given above (pp. 281, 282), what I suppose to be a natural and probable solution of the cause of Irenaeus's error. The point of *time* when the Apocalypse was written, could not have been regarded as an essential one, at the period when this writer lived; John survived two persecutions; these were only some twenty-five years apart; banishment probably accompanied both; the last of them preceded, by about a century, the time when Irenaeus wrote; and unless Irenaeus, in his youth, had fastened upon the point of time as a matter of critical inquiry, he might, in the sequel, make out his opinion merely from the book itself as it lay before him. There can scarcely be a well-grounded doubt that he did so; and consequently we have an opinion here which is dependent on his exegesis. It is unnecessary to say to those who are well acquainted with Irenaeus, that his interpretations were not always under the control of sound hermeneutical principles. Not a little of his

exegesis is uncritical; and some of it is absolutely repulsive, by reason of its visionary phantasies and conceits. But the point whether the Apocalypse was an *apostolic* and *accredited* book, was a very different matter. Let any one turn to the index of Scripture quotations in Massuet's edition of Irenaeus, and see with what frequency he has quoted the Apocalypse. The bare inspection will convince him how deeply Irenaeus reverenced the book in question. We know well, also, that he did so, because he regarded it as the production of the apostle John.*

On the whole, if the matter before us were one of mere *critical* skill and judgment, I am ready to confess, that we could not depend much on the opinion of Irenaeus, who sometimes errs egregiously in this respect. But as it is, or at least as it was in his time, a mere matter of *historical* inquiry; as he was familiar with the personal friends of John; as, at all events, he must know the common and prevalent views of the churches in respect to the authorship of the Apocalypse; we may fairly repose a good degree of confidence in his representations that have a bearing upon the point in question.

(9) Testimony of the epistle of Vienne and Lyons.

The epistle in question was written by the churches just mentioned, i. e. in their name, during the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, about 177. It was addressed to the churches in Asia Minor and Phrygia. Eusebius has inserted it at length, in his Hist. Ecc. V. 1.

Concerning Vettius Epagathus it says, that "he was a genuine disciple of Christ, *ἀκολουθῶν τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ*;" which last phrase is found in Rev. 14: 4. (p. 156, edit. Vales). In the same epistle (p. 159), it is said of the aged Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, when taken before the tribunal which was to condemn him, that *ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἀπεδίδου τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν*, i. e. 'as if he were Christ himself, he gave a good testimony;' alluding probably to Rev. 1: 5 or 3: 14. On p. 165 may be found another probable quotation, in the same epistle, from Rev. 22: 11; *ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρώθῃ ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι*. Possibly, in the second instance above, 1 Tim. 6: 13 may have been in the mind of the writer; and in the third, Dan. 12: 10. But the passages in the Apocalypse are both nearer to the expressions in the epistle of the churches, than to those last named.

Not improbably Irenaeus himself wrote the epistle in question. If so,

* I give a list of passages quoted, many of which are quite long, and embrace even a whole paragraph; Rev. 1: 12 seq., p. 256 in Massuet's edition. 1: 15, p. 244. 1: 17, 18, p. 256. 3: 7, p. 253. 4: 7, p. 190. 5: 6, p. 256. 6: 2, p. 258. 11: 19, p. 252. 12: 2 seq. (nearly the whole chapter), p. 326. 17: 8, p. 330. 17: 12 seq., p. 323. 19: 11 seq., p. 256. 19: 20, p. 326. 20: 6, p. 334. 20: 11 seq., p. 336. 21: 1 seq., p. 336. 21: 3, p. 252. 20: 5, 6, p. 336.

it would add nothing important to the list of testimony. But even on this ground, it would serve to show the usual familiarity of the churches with the Apocalypse, and the credit in which it was held. The passages in question do not, indeed, speak directly of John as the author of the Apocalypse, but they do speak as if the clauses quoted were considered as belonging to the Scriptures.

(10) Clement of Alexandria.

This celebrated writer flourished at Alexandria, from 192 to near 220. Although many of his writings are extant, still the references in them to the Apocalypse are not frequent.

There is no good ground for doubt, from anything which is found in his works, that he received and admitted the Apocalypse as a work of John the apostle. Thus in Strom. IV. 4 he says, when speaking of the righteous man, that "he shall sit among the twenty-four thrones, judging the people, *ὥς φησιν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης*;" the like in Strom. VI. Referring to the white robe mentioned in Dan. 7: 9, he says, that Christ was seen in vision as having a like robe; and then he adds: *καὶ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψίς φησι· Εἶδον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μεμαρτυρηκότων ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ἐδόθη ἑκάστῳ στολὴ λευκή·* which plainly comes from Rev. 6: 9, 11, p. 201, Wirceb. edit. On p. 528 he quotes, with an *εἴρηται γάρ*, Rev. 22: 12. Another passage (from p. 207) has frequently been quoted and relied upon, as vouching for the *apostolic* testimony of the Apocalypse, viz. "And the twelve gates of the heavenly city, like the twelve precious stones [Rev. 21: 19 seq.], we regard as indicating the excellence of the grace of apostolic declaration." I conceive the idea of this passage to be, that the twelve precious stones are an emblem of the messages of grace delivered by the twelve apostles. If this is correct, it exempts the passage from the class of direct testimonies to the origin of the Apocalypse, and places it only among those passages, which show that it was a book to which Clement made most respectful appeal.

Merkel, indeed, ranks Clement among the opposers of the Apocalypse, because, as he avers, 'he cites the Apocalypse without adding anything to show its authenticity.' But so does he also cite the Gospel, and first epistle of John; e. g. Paed. III. 13, *καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτίων ἡμῶν* [1 John 2: 2], *ὥς φησιν ὁ Ἰωάννης*. So in Strom. II. So, too, Clement often cites Paul and Peter, without naming them *apostles*. Nothing can be established from the mere manner of quotation. Clement also cites many *apocryphal* books, and sometimes even calls them *γραφή*. But so any pious writing, which circulated among the churches of the primitive age, was called; while *βιβλία* was appropriated to the Scriptures as such. It is the kind of *authority*

which Clement attributes to the books, rather than his manner of quotation, which is to be considered in relation to the case before us. And in respect to this, I see nothing to show that he did not quote the Apocalypse in the highest sense. When he attributes the work to *John*, there can be no reasonable ground to doubt, that he meant *John the apostle.*

(11) Testimony of Tertullian.

This animated and often truly eloquent writer flourished at Carthage, about 199—220. He was born in that city, and bred up in the study of the Latin and Greek languages, of philosophy and the Roman law, and possessed extensive information. He was somewhat enthusiastic in his feelings, and, in the latter part of his life, inclined to the defence of the Montanists. Of this sect more must be said in the sequel. Suffice it to say here, that they were strenuous assertors of *Chiliasm.* It has been said, in order to detract from the weight of Tertullian's testimony, that his Montanism influenced him in deciding so strongly in favour of the Apocalypse. But we shall see, that in this respect his opinion was the same before he became a Montanist as afterwards.

The declarations of Tertullian are so frequent and plain, that no doubt can possibly remain as to his belief. Thus, in Advers. Marcionem, III. 14, he says: "Nam et apostolus Joannes in Apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Dei prodeuntem, bis acutum, praeacutum, etc." i. e. he refers to Rev. 1: 16. Again (ib. § 24), speaking of the New Jerusalem, he says: "Hanc et Ezekiel novit, et apostolus Joannes vidit;" Rev. 21: 2. In De Pudicitia, cap. 19, he speaks of the sentiments of Paul and John, and in so doing he quotes largely from the Apocalypse, as containing the expression of John's views. In De Resurrect. c. 25, he appeals to Rev. 6: 9, respecting the souls of the martyrs as asking for retribution on the persecutors of the church, and also to various other passages in the Apocalypse, and cites them as Scripture. In c. 27 of the same, he speaks of the mention of the saints' vestments in the *Scriptures*, and then cites Rev. 14: 4 as an instance, and calls it *Apocalypsis Johannis.* De Anima c. 8, he says: "Sic Joannes in Spiritu Dei factus, animas martyrum conspicit;" viz. as related in Rev. 6: 9. In c. 9 of the same treatise, he speaks of John as having the spirit of *prophecy.* In Praescriptt. Haeret. c. 46, he speaks of the heresy of the Nicolaitans as condemned *in the Apocalypse, by the most weighty authority of the sentence of the Lord*, quoting Rev. 2: 6. In Advers. Judaeos c. 9, he speaks of Babylon as exhibiting a figure of the Roman city, *apud Joannem nostrum;* by which, of course, he means the apostle John, and adverts to Rev. xvii. In De Corona Militis, c. 13, he says: "From the inhabitation of that Babylon we are

removed, *in Apocalypsi Joannis;*" see Rev. 18: 4. In c. 15 of the same treatise, he says: "Nam et reges nos Deo et Patri suo fecit Christus Jesus;" Rev. 1: 6.

It were easy to adduce many more passages of the like nature; but it is superfluous. Everywhere in Tertullian, in his writings before and after his Montanism, he refers to the Apocalypse as Scripture, and as the work of John; and of John the *apostle*, too, for he knows nothing of any other John in the primitive age. Once he merely adverts to the fact, that Marcion declined to admit the authority of the book; Advers. Marc. IV. 5. But he seems not to think his denial worth controversy; and apparently so from the feeling, that he thought there could be no danger from such an unreasonable proposition. If there had been any controversy of this kind, when he wrote his books against Marcion, which seemed in any degree threatening to the credit of the Apocalypse, Tertullian was one of the last men not to have noticed it and entered warmly into it. It is evident that he never thought of serious opposition to the book, unless when he viewed the matter simply in reference to Marcion. Some opposition did arise on the part of the Alogi in Asia Minor, in his day; but his book (de Ecstasi) in defence of the Montanists has perished, and we know not what he may have said there concerning the Apocalypse. He speaks of this book in all his works now extant, as one about which the church had decided.

As to the *weight* of Tertullian's testimony, nothing more need be said, than that it shows what the general opinion of the churches was, at the time when he lived. This opinion of necessity rested on earlier tradition. The once living witnesses, the apostolic men, were all dead. But Tertullian, in his argument against heretics, everywhere urges with much strenuousness the uniform traditionary doctrines and views of the churches. We have no room for supposing, in respect to the point before us, that he did not accord with the all but universal opinion of the Christian church. The Alogi of his day he could not regard as seriously disturbing the harmony of this opinion, since they went the extravagant length of rejecting all the writings of John. Lücke suggests, by way of parrying the force of Tertullian's testimony, that 'we cannot conclude from the state and manner of it, that there were, at that time, no objections against the Apocalypse of a *historical* nature, nor that Tertullian put the tradition which he held, to a thorough test of examination.' It is true, indeed, we cannot vouch for it, that Tertullian knew everything about the history of the New Testament Canon, nor that he made scrupulous and critical examinations of tradition. But how many of all the Christian fathers are there, for whom we can give such vouchers? We must go down even to Origen and Jerome for *critical* examinations; unless indeed we recognize Melito as having

performed such a task. Yet what had Origen and Jerome to rely upon, except the tradition of the churches and ecclesiastical men? So far as mere matter of fact is concerned, e. g. whether this or that tradition existed and to what extent, Tertullian is a creditable witness; as credible, for aught I can see, as they. He was not an ignorant nor an obscure man. He knew extensively what had been done, and was doing, among Christians; and when he testifies in the manner in which he has, respecting the Apocalypse, I see no good reason why his testimony is not valid. It does not, and cannot prove directly and in an apodictic way, that John wrote the Apocalypse; but it shows that the churches as a body, about a century after his death, believed that he wrote it, and attributed it to him. And this is all which Tertullian, or any subsequent writer, can be considered as proving.

(12) Other early witnesses.

It seems quite probable that the early Latin version which Jerome corrected and amended, was made in the second century. Augustine speaks of the old Latin versions as being made *primis fidei temporibus*, Doctr. Christ. II. 11. Cassiodorus (Instt. div. Litt. II. p. 516), speaking of the *ancient* form of the Vulgate, reckons up the number and order of the New Testament books comprised in it, and mentions *Apocalypsis Johannis* as the last.

The Shepherd of Hermas is appealed to by Lardner and C. F. Schmid, as containing passages built upon the Apocalypse; but I cannot recognize, in any of them, a sufficient similarity to authorize us to count upon them. See in Schmidii Hist. Ant. Can. p. 298.

C. F. Schmid, (Offenbarung Johannis, pp. 238 seq.), has also appealed to the Recognitions of Clement in favour of the Apocalypse; moreover, to the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs; but in neither case do the passages produced by him bear any certain evidence of apocalyptic origin. Mere resemblance is not identity.

The Latin Fragment of some writer, who must have lived not far from A. D. 200, published by Muratori in his Antiq. Ital. (III. p. 854), beyond all question acknowledges the apostolic origin of the Apocalyse. Of this book the author speaks thus: "Apocalypsis etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt; i. e. as to the Apocalypse of John and Peter, we admit only [them]; which [last] some of ours are unwilling to have read in the church." Before this, the same Fragment says, respecting John: "Et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit, etc." Vide Schmid's Offenb. etc. p. 101 seq.

(13) Hippolytus, so-called bishop of Portus Romanus.

That there was a bishop of this name, who was the author of numerous writings somewhat distinguished, is clear not only from the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome, but in the year 1551 a statue of him was dug up at Rome, filled with various inscriptions, and among them a catalogue of his works; see in the preface to Fabricius' edition of the works of Hippolytus. Eusebius and Jerome, it would seem, were ignorant of his place of residence. Zonaras, Nicephorus, and G. Syncellus, name *Portus Romanus*. This some have placed in Arabia; some in Africa; others at Ostia near Rome. The influence which this bishop had at Rome, and the fact that his statue was found there, make the last conjecture altogether the more probable one. So the Chronicon Paschale: *ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ καλουμένου Πόρτου, πλησίον τῆς Ῥώμης*. He was a contemporary of Origen, and is said by Photius (Cod. 121) to have been a disciple of Irenaeus.

There can be no ground of doubt, that he held to the divine authority of the Apocalypse, nor that he maintained its Johannean origin. Had this been otherwise, Eusebius, or some of the ancients, would scarcely have failed to detect it, and to say something concerning it. But we need not rely merely upon this. In the work of Hippolytus *De Antichristo*, § 36, he says, "He [John], when he was in the isle of Patmos, *ὁρᾷ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίων φρικτῶν*, i. e. sees the Revelation of awful mysteries, declaring which he abundantly instructs others. Tell me, blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord, what thou didst see and hear respecting Babylon." Immediately he recites the whole of Rev. xvii. and xviii. as exhibiting the testimony of the apostle. Again, in § 47, he cites several verses from Rev. xi., introducing them with *λέγει Ἰωάννης*. In § 48, prefaced by *λέγει γὰρ Ἰωάννης*, he cites the last half of Rev. xiii. In § 50 he cites Rev. 13: 18, introducing it with *λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἀπόστολος*. In § 60, he cites a large portion of Rev. xii., premising *Ἰωάννης φησί*. In § 65, he quotes Rev. 20: 6, and assigns the words to John; and again he quotes Rev. 22: 15, with a *Ἰωάννης λέγει*. He adverts, in § 6, to Rev. 5: 5; and in § 29, to Rev. 17: 9.

There can be no good ground to doubt the genuineness of this work. Jerome names it among the works of Hippolytus, Catal. 61; and Photius also mentions it as one of the books of Hippolytus which he had read. The matter and manner speak for its genuineness. Moreover, a large fragment of Hippolytus Cont. Noetum exhibits the same views respecting the Apocalypse. In § 15 of this fragment, he speaks of what John says in the Apocalypse, and quotes several verses from Rev. vi. Opp. Hippol. p. 241, edit. Fabric.

Besides all this, Hippolytus wrote a work *περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐ-*

αγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, as appears from Jerome (Catal. 61), and from the inscription on his statue found at Rome. Probably this was a Commentary; and on this ground it was appealed to by Andreas and Arethas, at the beginning of their Commentaries. Possibly it was a defence of the books of John against the attacks of the Alogi. But the fact that Hippolytus wrote many commentaries, as Jerome testifies, (who also names many of them, Catal. 61), renders it more probable that the work in question was a *Commentary*. His work *De Antichristo*, from which the citations above are taken, is, indeed, little else than a Commentary on Daniel and John. Asseman (Bib. Orient. III. p. 15) produces the words of Ebed Jesu, asserting that "Hippolytus wrote a defence of the Apocalypse of John the apostle and evangelist."

Considered as the pupil of Irenaeus (Photius Cod. 121), and as the author of many Commentaries on various books of Scripture, and of other learned works; taking also into view the fact respecting the *statue*, erected to his memory as a token of high respect; we must regard the zeal of Hippolytus for the Apocalypse as good evidence of a strong conviction of the *apostolic* authority of the book. There is only one intervening link, moreover, between him and the contemporaries of John himself. Hippolytus may, like all the writers of his day, have been but an indifferent expositor of the symbols and tropes of the prophetic books; but this does not prejudice his testimony as to the main fact before us. Doubt has indeed been suggested, whether his *De Antichristo* is genuine. But Mill, who seems to doubt all the other works published as his, inclines to concede its genuineness; Prol. in Nov. Test. The great body of the learned have admitted it. Besides, Andreas (on Rev. 13: 1. 12: 18, and 17: 10) appeals to this work. On the whole, it must be reckless criticism that can scornfully set it aside. The *strength* of Hippolytus' conviction is a thing that ought to be noted. There is no proof that he was inclined to Montanism, so that he might be partial to the book on this ground. His intimacy with Origen forbids this supposition. His views, therefore, may be considered as the result of examination and of the influence of the times upon him. We cannot well suppose that he wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, or a treatise in defence of it, and yet did not examine at all the question respecting the authorship of the book.

(14) Testimony of Origen.

Whatever may be said in respect to any individual of the preceding witnesses, in the way of derogating from his testimony, there is at least no room for anything of this nature in regard to Origen. No one of all the Christian fathers had so much of zeal purely critical as Origen, and none pushed studies of this nature so far. He closed his astonishing and useful labours near the middle of the third century, having lived to

a good old age. He was, at all events, no Millenarian, and could not have been influenced by any sectarian views of this sort in his judgment respecting the Apocalypse. His testimony, therefore, has all the importance attached to it, which was possible at the time in which he lived; for he made researches respecting the Canon of both the Old Testament and the New, such as had not before been made, and in many respects with peculiar advantages. He was born and educated at Alexandria, where Clement of Alexandria was his religious teacher, and Ammonius Saccas, (as some have supposed, but without good evidence), his master in philosophy and rhetoric. He lived many years in Palestine. And to all his other qualifications he added that of a considerable knowledge of the Hebrew.

It would be useless to extract a large number of passages from his writings, in order to illustrate and confirm his testimony. Some two or three will suffice; with references to others, which may be consulted if the reader pleases.

Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. VI. 25) has presented one from Origen's Exposition of the Gospel of Matthew, in which this great critic has given the Canon of the New Testament, according to the result of his investigations. What is to our present purpose runs as follows: "What shall be said of him who leaned on the bosom of Jesus, viz. John? He has left us one Gospel, confessing that he could compose so many, that the world could not contain them; *and he, moreover, wrote also the Apocalypse*, being commanded to keep silence and not write what the seven thunders uttered." In his Commentary on John, Origen says: *φησὶν οὖν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου Ἰωάννης*, i. e. 'John, the son of Zebedee says, in the Apocalypse.' Again, in Commentary in Matthew, he says: "The king of the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John, who bore testimony on account of the word of truth, to the island of Patmos. John, moreover, teaches what concerns his testimony, not saying who condemned him; for he speaks thus in the Apocalypse: *Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει, κ. τ. λ.* [Rev. 1: 9] . . . . *καὶ ἔοικε τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι*, i. e. and he seems to have seen the Apocalypse in the island," pp. 300, 303, edit. Wirceb. Other passages to the like purpose may be found in Opp. I. pp. 34, 58, 755. II. pp. 169, 347, 473, 525, 632. III. pp. 60, 63, 75, 105, 405, 406, 408, 555, 719, 720, 867, 869, 909, 947, 961. Nor are these all.

One circumstance respecting Origen deserves well to be noted. In all the numerous instances in which he has mentioned and quoted the Apocalypse, not one word escapes him, to signify that there is any ground of doubt respecting its genuineness. How comes this? So he does not, in respect to the epistle to the Hebrews. While he is per-

suaded that it is *Pauline*, he still lets us know that there were difficulties in respect to this question. But not so, in regard to the Apocalpyse. And yet he must have known of the opposition made to John's Gospel and Apocalypse, on the part of the Alogi, if not (to the latter) on the part of Caius at Rome. But not a word escapes him concerning them. Lücke himself concedes (p. 315), that he has said nothing of any doubts; and this because he probably regarded them as too insignificant to be mentioned. It must have been for some such reason; for Origen was not the man to conceal difficulties which are formidable in their appearance. The Alogi, although they made some noise and bustle in their day, were, as we shall see in the sequel, too limited in their numbers and too circumscribed in their influence to be noticed by Origen, as it concerns the matter before us. He sympathized with them, indeed, in respect to opposition against *Montanism;* but he did not, like them, reject the Apocalypse of John.

The facts just stated may serve, perhaps, to cast some doubt on the alleged opposition of Caius to the Apocalypse of John. How could Origen fail to notice the opinion of so considerable a man? But of this, more in the sequel.

(15) Testimony of Nepos and Coracion.

These persons were officers in the church, and lived in Egypt, near the middle of the third century. Nepos was a strong Millenarian, and Coracion joined him, and even outdid him, in exalting the Apocalypse at the expense of the other sacred books. Nepos wrote a book against the *Allegorists*, and in defence of his Millenarian views; in which he everywhere appeals to the Apocalypse in support of them. This book gave rise to another in opposition to it, on the part of Dionysius of Alexandria, who seems to have been the first respectable opponent of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, unless indeed it can be shown that Caius of Rome was an opposer. Dionysius himself attributes to Nepos great zeal, activity, and learning in sacred things. He might after all have been but a poor interpreter of the prophecies, as in fact he seems to have been; but this is not important to the question, whether he admitted the divine authority of the Apocalypse and its apostolic origin. Of the latter there can be no doubt.

(16) Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

This eloquent man was first a heathen teacher of rhetoric, and late in life was converted to the Christian faith, about 246. There can be no doubt in regard to his views of the Apocalypse. In Opp. p. 368 he says: "In Apocalypsi, angelus Johanni volenti adorare se resistit, et

dicit: Vide ne feceris, etc.," quoting Rev. 22: 8. Again, in Opp. p. 176 he says: "*Aquas* namque *populos* significare, in Apocalypsi *scriptura divina* declarat, dicens: Aquae etc.," quoting Rev. 17: 15. Appeals to the Apocalypse as a part of Scripture he often makes; e. g. Opp. pp. 59, 354, 400, 402, 403, 408, 410, 424, 425, 427, 430, etc.

What the opinion at Rome was, in his time, is manifest from an epistle written to him by several presbyters and deacons there; in which Rev. 3: 21 is cited "quasi quadam tuba Evangelii.' Cyp. Opp. pp. 58—61. In pp. 476 seq. is a letter to Novatian, composed probably by some unknown person, in which repeated appeals are made to the Apocalypse as Scripture, and as being the work of John. E. g. (p. 479): "Item in eadem Apocalypsi, hoc quoque Johannes dicit sibi revelatum: Vidi, inquit, thronum magnum, etc," quoting Rev. 20: 11.

(17) Victorinus of Pettau or Petavionensis.

This writer, who was bishop of Pettau in Upper Pannonia, perished as a martyr in the persecution under Diocletian, A. D. 303. Among other works, he wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, in Latin; which may be found in Biblioth. Max. Patt. Vol. III. The genuineness of this has been called in question by some; but there is no sufficient reason for doubt, as to the great body of the work. Such passages in it as favoured Chiliasm, (for Victorinus seems to have been a Chiliast), are changed, or omitted, and others inserted in their room. Yet the work of expurgation does not appear to have been complete; for (p. 415) we find this clause: "In Judea, *ubi omnes sancti conventuri sunt*, et Dominum suum adoraturi," etc.

On Rev. 10: 4 he says: "Sed quia dicit se scripturum fuisse, Johannes, quanta loquuta fuissent tonitrua . . . vetatur scribere, sed relinquere ea signata, qui erat *apostolus*," etc. On 10: 11 he says: "quando hoc vidit Johannes, erat in insula Patmo . . . Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin . . . Postea tradidit hanc eandem, quam acceperat a Domino, Apocalypsin." The Commentary itself is a pledge for the writer's opinion as to the authority and importance of the book.

There is, moreover, a Latin poem against Marcion, printed with Tertullian's works, which Tillemont thinks was composed by Victorinus, and which frequently alludes to the Apocalypse, and ascribes it to John.

(18) Methodius, bishop of Olympus in Lycia.

This is one of the writers (fl. 290), whom Andreas mentions as testifying to the divine inspiration of the Apocalypse; see p. 305 above. The works of this father are mostly lost. Combefisius has, however, rescued some of them from oblivion, and these may be found in Biblioth. Max. III. p. 675 seq. In his *Convivium Virginum*, Orat. V. ad fin., it

is said: "Sicut ut Johannes significavit, incensum, quod in vialis 24 Seniorum erat, orationes sanctorum esse dicens." Rev. 5: 8. Again, p. 698, *D*, he says: "Nec partem habebimus, secundum Joannem, in resurrectione prima;" Rev. 20: 5. In his *De Resurrectione*, p. 711, he says: "Christus *primogenitus mortuorum* prophetico apostolicoque praeconio celebratur." Schmidius gives other passages, (Offenb. Johan. p. 310), but these are sufficient. Jerome calls his book (De Resurrectione) *opus egregium*. (Catal.).

(19) Lactantius of Firmium.

He belongs to the first quarter of the fourth century. He was an eminent teacher and example of eloquence, and has been commonly denominated *the Christian Cicero*. He was a zealous Chiliast, and of course, as we may naturally suppose, built on the Apocalypse as his foundation. But he very seldom quotes it, or indeed any other book of Scripture. After the prolonged representation which he gives of the millennial state, at the close of Instt. Lib. VII, he assigns a reason why he omits the quotation of the Scripture: "Haec sunt quae a *prophetis* futura dicuntur; quorum testimonia et verba ponere, opus non esse duxi, quoniam esset infinitum." Cap. 25. In Epit. c. 42, speaking of Christ he says: "Hujus nomen nulli est notum, nisi ipsi et Patri, sicut docet Joannes in Revelatione;" Rev. 19: 12. In Instt. VII. 10, he plainly alludes to Rev. 21: 8. Comp. Instt. II. 12, and see Epit. c. 72. His taste was as singular as his belief in respect to the Millennium. Instead of quoting the Scriptures, he everywhere and on all occasions interlards his discourses excessively with extracts from the putid Sibylline Oracles; which seem to have been as much an object of his wonder and reverence as the Scriptures. But in this respect we must regard him as employing his *rhetorical* art. That he makes such appeals for the sake of the heathen, and either as an *argumentum ad hominem* or *ad captandum*, seems very evident. Hence the Scriptures are but a secondary source of appeal, for him; and it is very difficult to say, where the boundaries between books canonical and uncanonical lay, as viewed by his mind. That he *enlarged the usual canon*, may have been true; and the appeal now made to him is principally to show, that in adopting the Apocalypse, he only did what was commonly done by the churches in his day.

(20) Athanasius of Alexandria.

This distinguished man, although then a youth, was present at the famous Council of Nice, and gave great assistance to those who opposed Arius. He was made bishop of Alexandria in 326, and died about 373.

Among the numerous writings which he has left behind him, there is

an important fragment of an ἐπιστόλη ἑορταστική (Opp. Tom. II.), which contains a list of the canon of the Old and New Testament. He divides the religious books, which were then before the church, into three classes, viz. (1) *Canonical*, which, he says, "are the source of salvation; in which only is the true doctrine of religion declared; to which no man can add, and from which none can take away." *Among these he places the Apocalypse.* (2) *Ecclesiastical*, i. e. such as may be read in the church for spiritual edification, but are not inspired. (3) *Apocryphal*, i. e. such as are supposititious, written by heretics, etc., and are adapted to mislead. Besides this full and unquestionable recognition of the Apocalypse, he elsewhere quotes and refers to the book; e. g. Cont. Arian. Orat. I. p. 415. Orat. II. p. 491. Orat. IV. p. 639. Ep. II. ad Serap. p. 684, etc.

It may be of some importance to note here, that this division of the Scriptures into three distinctly marked classes, does not correspond with the varying and inconstant divisions of Eusebius. But Origen alludes to a like division, and indeed he seems to have introduced it, viz. γνήσιαι (βίβλοι), νόθαι, μικταί. The first were the inspired canonical books; the second corresponded with the *apocryphal* of Athanasius; the third contained good things mixed with some errors, and hence were called μικταί. Athanasius (epist. ad Rufinum) recognizes this distinction; and in it Rufin himself concurs. Yet in the mouth of other and subsequent writers, the word *apocryphal* has occasionally quite a different meaning, viz. *dark, obscure, enigmatical, mysterious*, and the like; and finally, as such books of Scripture, e. g. the Apocalypse, were not usually read in the churches for edification, *apocryphal* came to mean, such books as through the difficulty of their contents remained as it were concealed in private hands, not being produced in the public assemblies. In this last sense, Gregory of Nyssa says: ἤκουσα τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν ἀκοκρύφοις . . . λέγοντος, etc., acknowledging the Evangelist as the author, but ranking the book among those not publicly read.

(21) Ephrem Syrus of Edessa or Nisibe.

This most copious writer flourished at the close of the third quarter of Cent IV. The common opinion is, that he was unacquainted with the Greek language. He wrote, in the Syriac, commentaries, essays, hymns, etc. Inasmuch as the Peshito or old Syriac version was wanting in respect to the Apocalypse, and the Philoxenian version was not made until a later period, it has been said and asserted by J. D. Michaelis and others, that Ephrem nowhere cites or refers to this book. Schmidius, after Hassenkamp, and recently Lengerke, have shown this to be erroneous. E. g. Opp. Syr. II. p. 332, he says; "John, *in his*

Revelation, saw a great, wonderful, divinely written book, sealed with seven seals, etc." Rev. 5: 1. Ib. III. p. 636: "Terror will seize upon Death, and he will give up all whom he has devoured . . . and they whom the sea has swallowed up, will be awaked and rise again;" Rev. 20: 13. In Opp. Graec. (translation) I. p. 39, he says: "The heaven is rolled up like a scroll; the stars fall down like the leaves of the fig-tree; the sun and moon are darkened;" Rev. 6: 12—14. Ib. II. p. 53: "As John has foreshown, saying: I saw a great white throne, etc.;" Rev. 20: 11. In Opp. Graec. II. p. 194. p. 252, he quotes Rev. 4: 8. Immediately after he says: "As John the θεόλογος declared, saying: Behold he cometh in the clouds, etc.," quoting Rev. 1: 7. In Opp. Graec. III. p. 190, he attacks the Chiliasts, and makes a kind of synopsis of the Apocalypse. It should be noted, that the *Greek* volumes of Ephrem are *translations* in which a part of his works is preserved, and not the originals composed by himself. It seems very clear, then, that in some way the Apocalypse was known to Ephrem, either through the medium of a Syriac translation which was before him, or else by the aid of some friend who understood the Greek. At all events, Ephrem does not seem to have been at all bound, as to the extent of his Canon, by the limits of the Peshito as it has come down to us. Must not the Apocalypse, then, in his time, have been circulated among the Syrian churches, and regarded as canonical? How, otherwise, could he appeal to it in writing for the public?

(22) Hilary of Poictiers.

He flourished at the same time with Ephrem Syrus. He has left behind him XII. books on the Trinity, commentaries on Matthew and the Psalms, and other works. In the Paris edition (1693) of his works, p. 226, he says: "Sanctus Johannes testatur," quoting Rev. 22: 2. Again on p. 891: "Et, ex familiaritate Domini, revelatione coelestium mysteriorum dignus Johannes."

(23) Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus.

He flourished at the same period as the two preceding writers, and left numerous works, many of which still survive. In his Haeres. 77, he says: "It is manifest, that it is written concerning the thousand years in the Apocalypse of John, and that the book is accredited among most persons and among the pious." In Haer. 51, he contends warmly against the Alogi, because they rejected the Gospel of John and his Apocalypse. In p. 457, he calls John "one of the holy apostles", and says that 'he has imparted of his holy gift, in presenting us with his Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse.' In Haer. 25, he combats the Nico-

laitans with words cited from Rev. 2: 6, and says that 'the Apocalypse is of holy John.' There can be no possible doubt as to his opinion.

(24) Basil, surnamed the Great.

He was contempory with the three last named writers, and was greatly distinguished for his eloquence and his attainments. His works are very numerous. In Opp. I. p. 249. p. 282, he quotes the Apocalypse as being the work of the Evangelist John. Arethas, in his Commentary, (init. cent. VI), speaks of Basil as vouching for the *θεόπνευστον* of the Apocalypse. These passages decide what rank the father in question assigned to the book before us, and who was regarded by him as the author.

(25) Gregory of Nazianzen.

This celebrated and most eloquent man, who was properly the bishop of Sasima in Cappadocia, flourished during the last half of the fourth century. Jerome calls him *preceptor meus;* Catal. 117. His testimony in respect to the Apocalypse has been cited both for and against it. It needs a little delay to examine this matter. It is quite clear, that in some passages of his works, Gregory refers to the Apocalypse as a part of Scripture; e. g. Opp. I. p. 573, he cites verbatim Rev. 1: 8, *ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, etc. Again, in I. p. 516, speaking of angels as presiding over the churches, he adds: *ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως*, etc.; Rev. 1: 20. He seems to have understood in a literal way the *angel* of the church at Ephesus, Smyrna, etc. In addition to this, we have seen (p. 305 above), that both Andreas and Arethas testify to Gregory's belief in the inspiration of the Apocalypse and its apostolic origin also; for their manner of speaking involves this. And such being the case, how can we well doubt their statement? Andreas was a contemporary of Gregory, and lived in the same province of Cappadocia, viz. at Caesarea, the capital of the province. Arethas probably succeeded him. It would seem that they must have known the views of Gregory.

Yet in Opp. Gregorii II. p. 98, in some verses by this father respecting "the genuine books of the inspired Scripture," after reciting all the scriptural books down to the Apocalypse, he omits that, and adds: *πάσας ἔχεις. Εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτός, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις·* i. e. 'Thou hast all; if there be any besides these, they belong not to the genuine.' I see no way, now, to solve this difficulty or to reconcile Gregory with himself, but to suppose that the Apocalypse is counted by Gregory as *ἀποκρύφη* or *μυστική*, and so is not inserted in his catalogue of books to be read in the churches. I have already cited a passage from Gregory of Nyssa, who was the youngest brother of Basil and contemporary of Gregory

Nazianzen, which speaks of the Apocalypse in such a manner as to cast some light, perhaps, on this difficulty. In his Opp. II. p. 44, he says: ἤκουσα τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννης, ἐν ἀποκρύφοις πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους δι' αἰνίγματος λέγοντος· . . . ὄφελον ἦσθα ψυχρὸς ἢ ζεστός, etc.; i. e. I have heard the Evangelist John enigmatically saying to such persons in his *hidden* or *concealed* [works] . . . I would thou wert either cold or hot, etc.; Rev. 3: 15. But this same writer, although he here speaks of the Apocalypse as being ἐν ἀποκρύφοις, in his life of Ephrem, III. p. 601, calls the Apocalypse ἡ τελευταία τῆς χάριτος βίβλος, i. e. the last book of grace, or, in other words, the last of the New Testament books, thus clearly acknowledging its canonical authority. Dionysius the Areopagite, (so-called, but belonging probably to the latter part of Cent. IV.), Opp. I. p. 246, 247, calls the Apocalypse τὴν κρυφίαν καὶ μυστικὴν ἐποψίαν τοῦ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ θεσπεσίου, i. e. the hidden and mystical vision of the beloved and inspired one of the disciples. Comp. with this, Epiphan. Haeres. LI. 3. p. 423. Philastrius of Brixià, the friend of Ambrose, (ad fin. Cent. IV.), in his work *De Haeresibus*, c. 88, exhibits a catalogue of canonical books, which, and which only, can be read in the churches. In this he *omits* the epistle to the Hebrews, and also the Apocalypse. Yet in cap. 60 he declares explicitly, that "those men are heretics who do not receive the Apocalypse, and that they have no understanding of the excellence and dignity of this writing." In c. 88, the same writer speaks of *Scripturae absconditae*, i. e. *apocryphal Scriptures*, of which he further says: "Quae etsi *legi* debent morum causa *a perfectis*, *non ab omnibus* legi debent." Such then was apparently the nature of the distinction made, at this time, between the New Testament books for *public reading*, and those which were reserved for *private perusal*. Gregory's catalogue of Scriptural books, then, may be regarded as comprising the former; while, at the same time, like Philastrius and others, he still admits the divine authority of the Apocalypse, as a work of the apostle John. Indeed, the quotations made from him in a preceding paragraph do not seem to leave us at liberty to draw any other conclusion, unless we charge him with downright contradiction; and this, in circumstances like these, can hardly be done with fairness.

(26) Chrysostom.

Chrysostom flourished during the last quarter of the fourth century and in the beginning of the fifth. His works which remain are very copious; and his character is too well known to need any description, here. He has left no discourses upon the Apocalypse; although he has written homilies on a large portion of the New Testament. But in his day, the eastern churches rarely made any public use of the Apoc-

alypse; as has been already stated above. Yet Chrysostom, in Hom. I. in Matth., has plainly and indubitably referred to the Apocalypse 21: 15—21, and drawn largely from it in his description of the heavenly city. References will also be found, to Rev. 20: 11. 19: 14. 5: 11. 20: 14. 12: 9. Accordingly, Suidas, under the title *Ἰωάννης*, says of Chrysostom: *Λέγεται δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ* [viz. of John] *τὰς τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν.*

(27) Ambrose, Tichonius, Julius Firmicus Maternus, and Philastrius.

Ambrose of Milan (ob. 397) beyond all doubt admitted the authority of the Apocalypse. One need only refer to his De Virgin. III., and his De Penitentia, cap. 9, for conclusive evidence of this.

Tichonius of Africa, the Donatist, (fl. c. 390), wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, and expounded the first resurrection mentioned in Rev. xx, as meaning *regeneration.* Of him Gennadius (De Vir. Illust. c. 18) says: "Exposuit et Apocalypsin Joannis ex integro, nihil in ea carnale, sed totum intelligens spiritale."

Julius Firmicus Maternus flourished about 340, under Constantine and Constans. In his work still extant, entitled De Errore profan. Religionum, c. 20, 25, he clearly acknowledges the Apocalypse as a part of Scripture, by appealing to it, and calling it *sancta Revelatio.*

Philastrius Brixiensis flourished about 380, and was the particular friend of Ambrose. He wrote a book on Heresies. His testimony is given under that of Gregory of Nazianzen above.

(28) Ruffinus; the Synod of Hippo; and the third and fifth Council at Carthage.

Ruffinus was a contemporary of Philastrius, and is well known for his translations of Origen, and his contest with Jerome. In his Expositio Symboli, etc., c. 37, he cites "the Apocalypse of John" as an integral part of the New Testament Canon.

The Council of Hippo, A. D. 393, speak out fully and most explicitly in Canon XXXVI, in favour of the Apocalypse as of divine and canonical authority; Mansi, Nov. Collect. Concil. III. p. 924.

The third Council of Carthage was held in 397. Can. XLVII. speaks of the Apocalypse in the same manner as the Council of Hippo. In both cases, probably out of deference to the church at Rome, it is added, at the close of the catalogue of canonical books: "De confirmando isto canone transmarina [i. e. Romana] ecclesia consulatur."

A few years after this, A. D. 419, was held the *fifth* Council at Carthage; and Can. XXIX. of this Council reckons the Apocalypse in the same manner among the divine Scriptures, and in the like way directs the matter to be referred to Boniface, the bishop of Rome, for confirmation. In this case the Council add, at the close of the 29th Canon:

"Quia et a Patribus ita accepimus in ecclesia legendum," i. e. we have received from the fathers, that these books [viz. all that had been mentioned] are to be read in the church. But in this catalogue we find also Solomon, Tobias, Judith, and Maccabees. The only value of this testimony, in the present case, is, that it speaks to the point of the general reception of the Apocalypse, at that period, as a divine book.

That the references to the church at Rome are not grounded on any doubt whether Rome would confirm the Canon proposed, seems to be clear from an epistle written by Innocent, bishop of Rome, in 405, to Exuperius the bishop of Toulouse, in which is a catalogue of the canonical books, agreeing with that of the fifth Council of Carthage. Of course "the Apocalypse of John" is included in the Canon; Mansi, ut sup. III. p. 1041.

(29) Augustine, bishop of Hippo.

At the time when the Councils of Hippo and Carthage above mentioned were held, Augustine flourished. He took an active part in them, and doubtless exercised an important influence. His opinion respecting the Apocalypse is subject to no manner of doubt. Everywhere in his writings, he appeals to it as a genuine and canonical book. He often cites it thus: "Joannes apostolus in Apocalypsi," Epist. 118; "Joannes Evangelista, in eo libro qui dicitur Apocalypsis," De Civit. Dei, XX. 7; "In Apocalypsi ipsius Joannis, cujus est hoc Evangelium," De Pecc. Mer. I. 27.

(30) Jerome.

Of the knowledge and critical merits of this father nothing needs to be said here. In all antiquity no one was his equal, as to a critical knowledge of the Scriptures. His acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew is known to all readers; and the Latin Vulgate, with his notes on the Old and New Testament, stands as an indelible monument of his acquisitions and his diligence.

To quote all that Jerome has said of the Apocalypse, would be superfluous. Two or three passages make the matter as clear as a hundred would. His letter to Paulinus gives in full the canon of the Old and New Testaments; Opp. IV. p. 571—574. In this he expressly includes the Apocalypse; and concerning this he says: "Apocalypsis Joannis tot habet sacramenta, quot verba. Parum dixi pro merito voluminis. Laus omnis inferior est. In verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiae." In Vol. IV. p. 168, 169, he speaks of "Johannes et apostolus, et evangelista, et propheta. *Apostolus*, quia scripsit ad ecclesias ut magister; *Evangelista*, quia librum Evangelii condidit... *Propheta*, vidit enim in Patmos insula, in quam fuerat a Domitiano principe

ob Domini martyrium relegatus, *Apocalypsin*, infinita futurorum mysteria continentem." In his Comm. on Ps. cxlix., he says: "Legimus in Apocalypsi Joannis, quae in ecclesiis legitur et recipitur, neque enim inter apocryphas scripturas habetur, sed inter ecclesiasticas, etc."

These passages put it beyond all doubt, that Jerome fully and unhesitatingly regarded the Apocalypse as a work of the apostle John. The last quotation also contains an intimation, that Jerome was aware of some opposition to the Apocalypse, and of some doubt about its canonical authority; but that, in spite of this, neither he, nor the churches in that quarter of the empire where he lived, cherished any doubts in respect to the subject. In his Epist. ad Dardanum we find a passage, which adverts more plainly to some doubts and difficulties among the *oriental* churches of his time, with regard to the Apocalypse. It runs thus: "Quod si eam [viz. the Epistle to the Hebrews] Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas, nec Graecorum quidem ecclesiae Apocalypsin eadem libertate suscipiunt; *et tamen nos utramque suscipimus*, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, etc." Here it is plain, that he was aware of the backwardness of some of the Greek churches, in admitting the Apocalypse to the honours which it enjoyed in the West. It is plain, moreover, that he regards this backwardness of the eastern churches as a thing recently brought into vogue; for he speaks of himself and others around him, as *veterum scriptorum auctoritates sequentes* in receiving the Apocalypse.

On the whole, the conviction of Jerome, a highly critical investigator, yea the master-critic of all antiquity, was an intelligent and an undoubting one. All that Dionysius of Alexandria had said against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, and all that Eusebius had recorded, was before him, and he was most extensively informed as to the opinion of the churches in different regions. Yet all this does not appear to have produced the least hesitancy in his mind, as to what he ought to believe respecting the apostolic origin and authority of the Revelation.

Lücke, however, in remarking on the testimony of Augustine and Jerome, expresses himself thus: "One perceives that their judgment did not rest on any *historical criticism*, but solely and only on the authority of *usage*." But I hardly know how to explain this. What does it mean when Jerome says: "Nos [Apocalypsin] recipimus . . . *veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes?*" What other sources of reliance could Jerome have? It was not, he says, the custom of his times which he followed, but *the authority of the ancient writers*. I am not aware what conclusions *historical* criticism could make, apart from this authority, or independently of it. To say that Jerome did not investigate as a critic, but merely as an implicit believer in tradition, would be to say what

neither his character nor his works would confirm. *Historical* criticism must build with the materials which history supplies; and this, as Jerome explicitly assures us, was the manner in which he built.

(31) Later Testimonies.

It is of little consequence to pursue the investigation of testimony lower down than the beginning of the fifth century, whither we have now brought it. It is confessed, on all hands, that the authority of Jerome and Augustine procured for the Apocalypse a reception all but universal, in after ages. Sulpitius Severus, Gelasius with seventy bishops assembled at Rome in 474, (if indeed his Decretum de Libris recip. et non recip. is genuine), Innocent I., Primasius, Cassiodorus, the Synod of Toledo in 633, Isiodorus of Seville about 630, Nilus, Isidore of Pelusium, Cyrill of Alexandria, probably Theodoret (he refers to the Apocalypse in several cases), Andreas of Caesarea, Arethas, the fourth Council at Constantinople, Jacob of Edessa, Johannes Damascenus, and finally Theophylact, all receive the Apocalypse as a divine book, and as the work of John the apostle; for where this is not expressly said, it is implied by the reception of it in the circumstances in which they were. Whoever wishes to pursue these testimonies, may find them in Schmid's Offenbar. Johannis, § 43 seq., and also in Lardner. A brief reference to most of them may be found likewise in Lücke, p. 343 seq.

Thus much for the direct or historical testimony respecting the authorship of the Apocalypse. If this stood alone, and there were no testimony, or at least no seeming testimony, of an opposite nature, no one conversant with these matters could well hesitate for a moment, to admit that John the apostle was the author of the book. But there are evidences of some variety of opinion, in ancient times, respecting the authorship of the Apocalypse; and some of them may be traced as far back as the latter part of the second century. Candour demands of us, that the witnesses on both sides of the question should be heard.

II. Examination of alleged direct testimony against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse.

We meet with nothing of the kind which deserves the name of testimony, until nearly a century after the death of the apostle John. The testimony of Justin, which has been canvassed above, appears to have been in accordance with the prevailing, if not the universal, views of the church, at a very early period; and when Irenaeus and Tertullian come to speak, no possible doubt can remain as to the views which they express. Tertullian, indeed, in the latter part of his life, became a Montanist; and this has been looked upon by some, as the principal induce-

ment for him to receive so heartily the Apocalypse, because it was regarded as the main support of the leading doctrine of the Montanists, viz., the visible and millennial reign of Christ on earth. But no trace has yet been found in Tertullian's writings, that he ever thought differently, at different periods of his life, on the subject of the Apocalypse. It is merely true, that, as was quite natural, his writings after he became a Montanist, more frequently than his other compositions, refer to the book in question; e. g. his De Pudicitia; De Resurrect. Carnis; De Anima; Cont. Marcionem, etc. Indeed, the very fact that the Montanists made their appeal to a book, already in general, if not universally, considered as a part of the New Testament Scriptures, is the only ground on which we can suppose Tertullian to have been persuaded to join them, or at least an indispensable condition. Had they appealed to some Apocalypse of Peter or of Paul, for example, such was the strong antipathy of Tertullian to all fictitious productions of the like nature, that we cannot for a moment suppose that he would have listened to them.

Once, and once only, does Tertullian make mention of any opposition to the Apocalypse. He is arguing vehemently against the innovations of Marcion, who mutilated the Gospel of Luke. He lays down the position, that, as to the New Testament Scriptures, what is most ancient is true and genuine, and only that. He appeals to the Gospels and Epistles, as sanctioned by Peter and Paul. He then says: Habemus et Johannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam, *si Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit*, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Johannem stabit autorem; Cont. Marc. IV. 5. Lücke (p. 301) thinks that the last clause here refers only to John as the founder of the *alumnas ecclesias*, i. e. of the seven Asiatic churches; and he taxes Schott with error, because he looks upon Tertullian as here claiming *ancient tradition* in favour of the Apocalypse. But Lücke himself must, after all, be in the wrong here. Tertullian, in the whole preceding context, is defending the *antiquity* of the sacred books. When he mentions Marcion's rejection of the Apocalypse, he at once vindicates the *antiquity* of this, by appealing to John, the author of it, as the first bishop of the seven Asiatic churches. He then goes on, in the same way, to show that the canonical Gospel of Luke is genuine, because all the churches had received it from the beginning. I cannot, therefore, have a doubt that Lücke has here mistaken the meaning of Tertullian. The passage, moreover, in the connection in which it stands, is one of the most direct and forcible among all the ancient testimonies, with respect to the historical evidence by which the authorship of the apostle John is supported.

Of the *doubts* of Marcion, Tertullian says not another word. Of

course he looked upon them as insignificant, and unworthy of further notice. Had there been doubts that were spreading, and patronized, and thus dangerous to the church or to a part of the Scriptures, Tertullian is the last man who would have kept silence.

(1) Opposition to the Apocalypse by the Alogi.

But there were some doubts about the Apocalypse in Tertullian's day, that arose from another quarter. They took their rise, as we shall see in the sequel, from opposition to Montanism.

Not long after the middle of the second century, Montanus, an obscure but zealous and enthusiastic man, and possessed in a more than ordinary degree, as it would seem, of the talent of popular persuasion, made his development at Pepuza, a town of Phrygia. He made pretences to prophetic ecstasy, and declared that he was the Comforter or Paraclete, whom Christ had promised to guide and further instruct his disciples. He seems to have regarded the Paraclete as some individual person or man, on whom the Holy Ghost would shower down his gifts in an extraordinary manner. The leading and peculiar doctrines of his system were, the personal and millennial reign of Christ on earth; rigorous asceticism as to fasts, celibacy, contempt of the world, etc.; and perpetual exclusion from the church of all who were guilty of incontinence, murder, and idolatry. By his zeal and activity, and probably, moreover, by a good degree of eloquence, he soon won over a considerable party in Asia Minor. The only distinguished man that we know of, who joined this party, was Tertullian. He wrote a book in their defence; which is lost. The sect, however, must have been considerable; for so late as A. D. 530 and 532, we find laws of Justinian passed against them, Cod. I. tit. V. l. 18—21.

At Thyatira, the Montanists met with great success. Only a small party remained, who were opposed to them. By degrees, as the contest grew warm, this minority separated themselves from the Montanists, and went all lengths in opposition to them. At the same time, the churches in general became so adverse to the presumptuous claims and extravagances of Montanus, that he and his party were excluded from their communion. Tertullian complains vehemently, that the bishop of Rome had been persuaded by Praxeas to withdraw all favour from them; Cont. Prax. c. 1. It should be noted, however, that it was not on the ground of their denying any of the usual doctrines of the church, that the Montanists were excommunicated, but on the ground of their extravagances and their presumptuous claims.

The dispute at Thyatira did not stop even here. Not content with opposing the Montanists by arguing from the usual Scriptures, the adverse party went on to deny the canonical authority and genuineness of

the Gospel of John and of the Apocalypse. Montanus supported his claim to be the Paraclete by the first of these books, and his doctrine of the Millennium by the second. His adversaries took the shortest way to rebut his views, viz. that of rejecting the books of Scripture to which his appeals were principally made.

The fact that they did reject these books, is testified by Philastrius (Haeres. 60), Epiphanius (Haeres. 51 and 54), Johan. Damascenus (Haeres. 51), and Augustine (Haeres. 30). In consequence of this denial, Epiphanius, in his account of them, gives them the name of *Ἄλογοι*, Alogi. The party does not seem to have had even a separate name, before his day, (fl. 375); nor does it appear to have ever been considerable enough to attract much notice. Eusebius, so watchful to point out heresies or commotions in the church, says not one word of them; and the authors above named, (almost 200 years after the rise of the Alogi), have given but a very meagre and unsatisfactory account of them. It seems almost certain, that if they had ever spread themselves much beyond Thyatira and its near neighbourhood, that Eusebius must have known and noticed them, as he has done other sects. Nor could they have lasted long as a party; for this would have surely brought them into more notice. No person is even named as the leader of this sect; and it seems clear, from all these circumstances, that it never could have been anything more than a mere temporary party, occasioned by the dispute with the Montanists at Thyatira.

It is necessary to bring before our minds the facts that have just been related, in order to form a proper judgment respecting the rejection of the Apocalypse by the Alogi. Philastrius and Epiphanius, the two original sources from which everything is derived that respects the Alogi, have neither of them given any reasons or grounds of a historical or critical nature, why they rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. In the absence historically of all reasons of this kind, we are left merely to form an opinion from the nature of the case. Nor is it difficult to satisfy our minds, in regard to this. The dispute ran high, and both parties were violent and embittered. The Montanists leaned upon the two books of John. Not able, probably, to meet their antagonists on *exegetical* ground and refute them, the Alogi, tacitly yielding to the exegesis of the Montanists, drew the conclusion that the books which contained such sentiments could not be divine, and of course could not be composed by an apostle. Nothing is more natural than this. How often has the same thing happened in other ages and in different places! The leading Reformer had a warm dispute with the Romanists on the subject of *justification by faith alone*. They appealed with all confidence to the epistle of James, as deciding against him. He, unable to overthrow their exegesis, rejected the book itself, and called it, in the

way of contempt, *epistola straminea*. Yet he admitted New Testament books into his Canon, which have less historical evidence in their favour than this. Many a book, in the New Testament and in the Old also, has been ejected from the canon, or denied a place there, by individuals, or by parties, to whose sentiments it appeared to be particularly hostile. It is the easiest way to dispose of arguments that make against us, by such a summary process.

Inasmuch now as Eusebius does not even allude to the Alogi, nor either he or Dionysius of Alexandria refer to them, or to any other sect, as doubting the apostolical origin of the Apocalypse on historical grounds; inasmuch as the nature of the case explains the ground of opposition by the Alogi; and specially since no teacher or literary man, so far as we know, ever appeared among the Alogi, who could adequately investigate matters of this kind; it would seem that the opposition of the Alogi to the Apocalypse cannot be regarded as having any weight in the scale of criticism. Dionysius, in alluding probably to the Alogi (in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VII. 25), states merely that they complained of the Apocalypse as being dark, enigmatical, unintelligible, and unreasonable. But all these are mere *subjective* reasons, and belong to their understanding and judgment, rather than to the book itself. Epiphanius alludes to similar reasons; some of which he assays to refute. No one can doubt, who knows the opposition of Dionysius to the Apocalypse, that he would have proffered *historical* reasons for the doubts of the Alogi, in case he had found them in his day. But inasmuch as he does not, we must believe that he did not find them.

Candour seems to demand, then, that we should subscribe to what Lücke says, at the close of his examination of this matter: "It is clear as the light, that the Alogi rejected the Apocalypse, not on any historical ground . . . but only and simply because of their exegetical ignorance of it, and from lack of being well informed in matters pertaining to polemical theology;" p. 306. And inasmuch as they attributed John's works to *Cerinthus*, we may well say, with Lücke, "With better exegetical information, and some taste for poetry, they would not have interpreted the Apocalypse in so literal and lifeless a manner as to find it destitute of meaning; still less would they have found in it the Chiliasm of Cerinthus, which even the most superficial perusal can hardly find therein;" p. 306. It is indeed very evident, that party spirit and the heat of contest led them on, and that they were guided neither by taste, nor learning, nor sound judgment. Otherwise, how could they have rejected the *Gospel* of John, as well as the Apocalypse? It cannot be supposed that this was on the ground of any historical evidence against it. Their judgment, in the one case, had its basis on the same ground as in the other, viz., their party feelings. It is plain, that the Montanists must

have held both books to be the work of the apostle John, and as such have appealed to them; otherwise they would not have been disclaimed by the Alogi as his. And this is another evidence, what the views of the church in general were, at that period, in respect to these books; for the Montanists were not accused of any departures from the common faith, in regard to matters of this kind.

(2) Rejection of the Apocalypse by Caius, a Presbyter at Rome.

Three several times Eusebius makes mention of this individual. In Ecc. Hist. II. 25, he introduces him as living at the time of Zephyrinus bishop of Rome, (i. e. at the commencement of Cent. III.), and as having written a book against Proclus, an advocate of the Montanists, and given some testimony about the burying-place of Peter and Paul. On this occasion he calls him *ἐκκλεσιαστικὸς ἀνήρ*; which shows that he belonged to the church catholic, and was in good standing there. In VI. 20. he mentions him again as the author of a *διάλογος* against Proclus, in which he inveighs against the authors of new [fictitious] Scriptures, and reckons only thirteen epistles of Paul. On this occasion, Eusebius calls him *λογιώτατος, most eloquent;* and he intimates, that he (Eusebius) himself had read his *Dialogue*, *ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς . . . διάλογος*, etc. The third passage, (which is put in the *last* place here because of its present importance), is in III. 28. Eusebius had been speaking of the Ebionites, and now goes on to notice the heresy of Cerinthus. Among other things, he relates what Caius says of him, in the Dialogue against the Montanist Proclus, already mentioned above; which is as follows: *Ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφει· Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος, ὁ, δι' ἀποκαλυψέων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τετραλογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει, λέγων· Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπείγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. Καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀριθμὸν χιλιονταετίας ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς θέλων πλανᾷν λέγει γίνεσθαι.* That is: 'He [Caius] writes thus respecting him: Moreover Cerinthus, also, by revelations as if written by a great apostle, in a lying manner introduces to us narrations of wonderful things as shown to him by angels, saying, that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ will be earthly, and that the flesh, living in Jerusalem, will again serve lusts and pleasures. And being an enemy to the divine Scriptures, and wishing to mislead, he says that a thousand years will be spent in wedding feasts.'

This is the celebrated passage on which so much has been said and written during the last seventy-five years. To canvass all that has been said, would be wearisome and to little purpose. Let us see what are

the *facts* in regard to this passage, the writer of it, and the design that he must have had in view.

We have seen, that the Dialogue of Caius was in the hands of Eusebius, and that he has quoted from it. The design of it is explicitly stated also. Caius is writing in opposition to Proclus, a strenuous advocate of Montanism. That the Montanists appealed, in regard to their millennial views, to the Apocalypse of John, there can be no doubt. The dispute between them and the Alogi, is ample proof of this. It was for this reason, that the Alogi denied the genuineness of the Apocalypse. They also attributed the book to Cerinthus; as they did also the Gospel of John. Caius, so far as the Millennium is concerned, is acting the same part as the Alogi. Was there, then, an Apocalypse *forged* by Cerinthus, which was extant in that day, and to which Caius here adverts? Or was the Apocalypse of John *interpolated* by Cerinthus, and rejected with scorn by Caius? Or did Caius reject the Apocalypse itself of John, as appealed to by his opponent?

Each of these positions has been assumed and defended, by writers of no small ability. For each more or less may be said, with some plausibility. But as *facts* are, there seems to me but one conclusion which will abide a critical trial. Caius, as it would seem, intends to put down the authority appealed to by the Montanists. And what was this? Most probably, not any fictitious work of Cerinthus, nor any work of John interpolated by him. There is not a word in Eusebius or in any other ancient writer, not in Irenaeus or in Epiphanius, about such a work of Cerinthus; much less about the reliance of the Montanists on such a work, unless what the Alogi have said, and Caius, and Dionysius (of whom in the sequel), is to be taken as evidence of it. Tertullian, a Montanist, makes no appeals of such a nature; nor could he, in consistence with his well known views about Scripture. If now we suppose that the Apocalypse of John was the book appealed to by Proclus, then the declarations of Caius, if correct, would cut the nerve of Proclus' argument; for the tenor of Caius' argument for such a purpose would be this: 'Your opinion is supported only by a book which sprung from a heretic, and therefore weighs nothing.' But on the supposition that the Montanists appealed merely to a well known fictitious Apocalypse, why did Caius introduce the case of Cerinthus? It might be said, indeed, that it was in the way of illustration; i. e. it was as much as to say: You are doing just what Cerinthus did, viz. appealing to false Revelations. Nor can the appositeness of this reply be denied, in case the Apocalypse in question was fictitious. Yet the similarity of Caius' arguing to that of the Alogi, as before exhibited, seems to be so obvious, that one is naturally inclined to believe, that he must have had the same Apocalypse in view; and more especially as he lived at the

same time with the Alogi. How could Proclus, who appealed to the Apocalypse of *John*, have been confuted by Caius, in case Caius did not mean to say, that the Apocalypse to which his opponent appealed was fictitious, but merely that Cerinthus composed a certain fictitious Apocalypse, which had no direct relation to the present one? This question seems to me, in connection with the facts before stated, well nigh to settle the controversy about the meaning of Caius. Must he not have meant, that the book to which Proclus appealed was composed by Cerinthus, and therefore unworthy of credit? But Proclus surely appealed to an Apocalypse, which he supposed to be the *work of John*. Must it not be this work, then, of which Caius affirmed, that it was composed by Cerinthus? This seems, at least, to be the more probable state of the case. Yet there are some grounds of doubt; and these must be stated.

(1) The simple reading of the passage in Eusebius, as produced above, makes naturally the impression, that Caius accuses Cerinthus of forging a book of revelations, which set forth his extravagant and sensual notions respecting the Millennium; and that, in order to gain credit, he affixed to this production *the name of a great apostle*, i. e. of John, who most probably must be meant. Were it not for the circumstances and the object of the dispute with Proclus, which seem to demand the understanding of the authority to which the latter appeals; and were it not that no writer of antiquity, if we make the exception above noted, has hinted at such a fictitious or interpolated work of Cerinthus; we should at once give to the passage such an interpretation. But these considerations stand in the way of so doing.

(2) The title itself as given by Caius,—*ἀποκαλύψεις* plural, not *ἀποκάλυψις*—would seem to indicate a work different from that of John. Eusebius always refers to the Apocalypse by the noun singular, *Ἀποκάλυψις;* and this seems to strengthen the consideration. But if we regard the *ἀποκαλύψεις* of Caius as referring to the *contents* of the Apocalypse, which consist of many visions or revelations, and not to the title, this difficulty seems to vanish. Indeed, Eusebius has quoted a passage from Dionysius of Alexandria, in which the Apocalypse is spoken of in such a way, and by the use of the plural *ἀποκαλύψεις*. It runs thus: "[The author] calls himself our brother and companion, and a witness of Jesus, and blessed *ἐπὶ τῇ θεᾳ καὶ ἀκοῇ τῶν ἀποκαλυψέων, on account of the seeing and hearing of the revelations.*" In a like way Caius may have used *ἀποκαλύψεις*, in the passage under consideration.

(3) 'The Chiliasm which Caius attributes to the Revelations in question, is entirely diverse from that which John has really taught. Must not the book, then, have been diverse from that of John?' Cer-

tainly, I reply, in case we may suppose that Caius gave it a fair and enlightened exegesis. But what is the ground for supposing that he did? Did not the Alogi interpret the Apocalypse in the like sensuous manner? Did not even Dionysius the same? Had not Eusebius misgivings about the Apocalypse, on a like ground? Did not Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, yea all the early Christian fathers who were Millenarians in the grosser sense, interpret in the like way? Nothing is plainer, than that the fathers transferred to the millennial period many of the prophecies of Isaiah and others respecting it, in a kind of *literal* manner. Everywhere we find traces of this. Can it be any matter of surprise, then, that Caius does the like? In fact we are not, as I apprehend, to regard the gloss put upon the Apocalypse in this case by Caius, as the result of sober investigation on his own part. He takes the exegesis of Proclus, which was doubtless grossly material or sensuous, and charges it upon the book to which Proclus appealed. In such circumstances, it matters little what the book actually means in the view of an enlightened and dispassionate interpreter; it is enough for Caius, that he takes his opponent at his word, and so rejects the authenticity of the book. At that time, who had led the way to a more sober interpretation?

(4) Theodoret (Fab. Haeret. II. 3) speaks in such a way of Cerinthus, as seems to imply, that he had forged an Apocalypse for the promotion of his own designs. His words run thus: *Κήρινθος καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις τινὰς ὡς αὐτὸς θεασάμενος ἐπλάσατο, καὶ ἀπειλῶν τινων διδασκαλίας συνέθηκε, καὶ τοῦ κυρίου τὴν βασιλείαν ἔφησεν ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι*, etc.; i. e. 'Cerinthus forged certain revelations, *as if he himself had seen them*, and added descriptions of certain terrible things (lit. doctrines of certain threatenings), and declares that the kingdom of the Lord will be established on earth,' etc. The sequel, in Theodoret, merely repeats, with some variations, what is contained in the passage of Caius about the Millennium, as quoted above from Eusebius. If now it could be ascertained, that Theodoret had himself seen the *Ἀποκαλύψεις* of Cerinthus, this passage would settle the question, that there was a book of that name forged by Cerinthus; for, as we see, Theodoret speaks of the Revelations as being seen by Cerinthus himself. So much is clear, viz. that Theodoret understood Caius as speaking to this purpose. The mistake, if there is one, seems to be made in regard to the clause *αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας*, in the passage from Caius. As it now stands, *αὐτῷ* refers to the *great apostle;* but if Theodoret read *αὐτῷ*, then it would refer to Cerinthus. Hence, probably, his *ὡς αὐτὸς θεασάμενος*, referring to Cerinthus. Nor is it clear what the *ἀπειλῶν τινων διδασκαλίας συνέθηκε* means. Does it refer to the threatenings at the end of the Apocalypse; or to the terrible threatenings in the body of

the work, (omitted in Caius' description as quoted by Eusebius); or to another book, full of threats, composed by Cerinthus? We have no means of deciding positively. Yet the whole of Theodoret's description is such, as to make the impression distinctly on my mind, that he merely copies from Eusebius, with some comments and variations of his own. What Eusebius or Caius has left uncertain, he represents as certain, viz. that Cerinthus himself saw, or represents himself as seeing, the revelations in his book. Eusebius leaves this dubious, very possibly because he doubted himself what Caius meant to say respecting it. Had the former ever seen such a forged book of Cerinthus, or heard of it in a credible way, how could he have failed to give us some hint of it? Caius' book had come down to him; but not a word of the work of Cerinthus.

On the whole, after all that has been done to make this matter clear, some doubt must rest upon it. The ground of all the doubt is the want of *explicitness* in the statements of Caius and Eusebius. There is nothing in the case which renders absurd the position, that Caius meant to refer to a supposititious work of Cerinthus himself. It may be, that Caius means simply to compare the doings and opinions of Cerinthus with those of Proclus. But when he speaks of *τετραλογίας ἡμῖν . . . ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει*, who can be meant by *ἡμῖν* but the church catholic? And how could Cerinthus' work be spoken of as introduced to the church catholic? Lücke thinks this to be a decisive circumstance in regard to the work spoken of, and that it can refer only to the Apocalypse of John. But this is giving more emphasis to *ἡμῖν . . . ἐπεισάγει* than necessarily belongs to them. The attempt to introduce, the effort to introduce, the design to palm, the forged work upon the church catholic, might be, and naturally would be, described in the same way.

We have no alternative, then, but to leave this matter in some uncertainty. If zeal or effort could have fully settled it, it had long ago been settled. But there is, as has been said, a want of explicitness in the sources to which we must appeal, that forbids us to assume a confident position. My own mind preponderates in favour of the view, that Caius aims at that Apocalypse to which Proclus appeals for confirmation of his views; and, consequently, that he means to take away the support of Proclus, by showing that his authority is supposititious.

Why *Cerinthus* is hit upon as the author of the forged book, is a question that we cannot with certainty answer; but the principal reason seems to be, that Cerinthus was not only a Millenarian, but probably the leading author or defender of very early Chiliasm, i. e. of the Chiliasm which was of the grosser and sensual kind. Moreover Cerinthus was a heretic, a man of some talent, and the author of many new and strange opinions. There was, as it would seem, no general tradition

among the ancient churches, that Cerinthus wrote an Apocalypse. Caius most probably, then, must have argued by drawing conclusions from the similarity of Cerinthus' millenarian opinions and those of Proclus.

On the other hand; had Caius known and studied the opinions of Cerinthus, as they have come down to us, he could never have thought of him as the author of the Apocalypse; so exceedingly diverse are the views of this book, in many respects, from those of the heretic in question. For example; that the world was created by an Aeon; that this Aeon was the God of the Jews, and not the supreme God; that Jesus was merely a natural man, with whom the Logos was united at baptism, but forsook at his crucifixion; that the laws of Moses must be observed by Christians, etc.; are things wholly incompatible with the Apocalypse. Had Caius known of these opinions, (and why should he not?), how could he attribute the Revelation of John to Cerinthus? In fact, the more we examine the judgment of Caius in this matter, on the supposition that he aims at the Apocalypse of John, the less respect must we feel for his critical opinion and for his exegesis.

And now, how much can be made of Caius' assertions, supposing, for the sake of argument, that they are aimed at the Apocalypse of John? Little, or nothing, most certainly. For what is the ground of them? Merely and only his antipathy to Chiliasm. John could not have written a book, which teaches carnal Chiliasm; and therefore Cerinthus, who taught such a doctrine, must have written it. Such seems to be the logic that he employs. His own subjective theological views and judgment are plainly the basis of his opinion. There is no appeal to testimony, tradition, or the opinions of the churches. Most plainly, therefore, he argues in the same way as the Alogi; although there is no evidence that he extended his conclusions to the *Gospel* of John, as they did. The result, then, is hardly worth the labour necessary to obtain it. It can make nothing against the Apocalypse, at all events. A judgment made up in such a way, and for such a reason, has very little claim to our respect or consideration. The fact, that he palms a carnal Millennium upon the Apocalypse, is enough to show how little he understood the book, and indeed how little he had studied it. Had not so much been made of his testimony, as a witness against the Apocalypse, it would be but a waste of words to discuss it at so great length.

(3) Testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria.

In many respects Dionysius was a distinguished man, and he appears to have enjoyed a high reputation among his contemporaries. He was a pupil of Origen, and outlived him only eleven years. He became

bishop of Alexandria in 248, and died in 265. A number of his works are still extant; but many have perished. Fragments, however, of most of his lost works are scattered through the volumes of the later Fathers; and a long extract is preserved in Eusebius, from a work of his, in two books, entitled *περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν*, which has relation to the subject before us.

The occasion of this last named work must be briefly stated. Nepos, an Egyptian bishop in the district of Arsinoë, a man apparently of ardent piety and considerable talent, but somewhat enthusiastic, became a strenuous advocate of the *literal* Millennium, i. e. of the earthly reign and kingdom of Christ. Origen, so distinguished for his critical knowledge of the Scriptures, had before this avowed his belief in the *spiritual* sense of the Apocalypse, and consequently had found no difficulty in the supposition that John wrote the book. But Nepos rejected this mode of interpretation; and in a work entitled *ἔλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν* (confutation of the allegorists), he maintained with great warmth the literal reign of Christ on earth. It would seem, from what Eusebius says of Nepos' work, that his views approached very near to those of the Montanists, in respect to the nature of this reign, i. e. that they were inclined toward sensual gratifications too much to satisfy the more enlightened and spiritual minded.

Nepos raised up a large party in his favour, in the neighbourhood of his residence. After his death, Coracion, his follower, kept up the excitement, and even increased it; so that a number of churches withdrew themselves from connection with the mother-church at Alexandria. Dionysius (about 255) proposed a conference for the purpose of mutual explanation and argument. It was accepted; and this distinguished man, by his ability and good temper, succeeded in satisfying Coracion and his friends that they were in an error. Thus the matter ended. But Dionysius, in order to prevent the recurrence of the like strife, soon after wrote a work in two books, entitled, as has been mentioned, *περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν*. In the first book he contends against the opinion of Nepos; in the second, he gives his own views of the Apocalypse. From these, as exhibited by Eusebius (in Ecc. Hist. VII. 24. 25), I shall now make some extracts.

After preparing the way for the expression of his own views, by speaking in a kind and brotherly manner of Nepos and his adherents, and after giving some reasons why he deems it important to undertake a refutation of his writings, particularly because some had even substituted the work of Nepos in the place of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, he appeals, in respect to the Apocalypse, (on which Nepos and his party wholly depended, and the credit of which, it would seem, Dionysius therefore felt it to be important to shake), first of all,

to what some of the *ancients* thought and said in regard to that book. His appeal runs thus:

"Some of those before us have rejected and gainsayed the book entirely, examining in detail chapter by chapter, and showing it to be destitute of knowledge and reason. The very inscription, they aver, is false; for *John* is not the author. It contains, moreover, no *revelation;* for it is covered with a strong and thick veil of ignorance. The author of this writing, also, was not only none of the apostles, but he did not even belong to the saints or ecclesiastical men. On the other hand, Cerinthus, he from whom the heresy was derived which is called after his name, gave to this his own work a name that was venerable [i. e. of John], in order to obtain credit for it. For this is the purport of his doctrine, that the kingdom of Christ will be earthly, that it will consist altogether of those things of which he, with his animal and entirely carnal appetites, was desirous, and of which he dreamed, viz. of the gratification of the appetite, and specially of impure desire, i. e. in meats, and drinks, and weddings, and (as means by which such desires might be more creditably gratified) in feasts, and sacrifices, and the slaughter of sacred victims." VII. 25.

Such is the statement of Dionysius respecting the opinion of *τίνες . . . τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*. Who were they? He names no one; but still it seems almost certain that he refers to the Alogi and to Caius. At all events, the opinions of the *τίνες* which are mentioned, tally well with the opinions of those just named. The millennial kingdom of the *τίνες* is earthly and sensual; the Apocalypse is obscure and unintelligible, etc.; just what the Alogi and Caius affirmed. Then again, it was not John, but Cerinthus who wrote the book; the very same thing that was affirmed by them. If Dionysius did not mean by *τίνες . . . τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*, the Alogi and Caius, he must at least have meant such as cherished the same opinions which they advocated.

But what were the objections of the *τίνες* to the Apocalypse? Merely those which we have already canvassed, viz., such as were urged by the Alogi and Caius, and were merely and wholly of a *subjective* nature. From a false exegesis of the book they drew conclusions against its apostolical origin, and ascribed it to Cerinthus. Of course these objections do not weigh a grain of sand in the balance of just criticism.

But has Dionysius no knowledge of more weighty objections to the Apocalypse among the ancients? None. Most surely he would have produced them if he had. Could he but have appealed to ancient tradition, i. e. to historical testimony, in favour of his position, it was impossible that he should have failed to perceive its superior importance and cogency; and of course he would have placed it in the front of all his arguments. But not a word of all this. He can only allege, that

some of the ancients rejected the Apocalypse because of its obscurity, and because it taught (as they supposed) an earthly and carnal Millennium. Most clearly, then, Dionysius knew of no *historical* testimony against the Apocalypse. It could not well have escaped an intelligent pupil and friend of Origen, if there was any such testimony at that time. Of all the men of that day Origen would be the most likely to know it; but in all his works, he has never even intimated that a doubt of the genuineness of the Apocalypse was entertained by the churches. He speaks of this book, with the same certainty that he does of the *Gospel* of John. (See pp. 323 seq. above).

That Dionysius meant to refer to the *Alogi* and to *Caius*, is the more probable from the mode of expression, *τίνες . . . τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*. This indicates, that they belonged to the church catholic or orthodox, and were not heretics. *Τίνες . . . πρὸ ἡμῶν* is as much as to say, 'some who belonged to our church in days that are past.' He might have referred to the Marcionites, and to some other of the Gnostics, as rejecting the Apocalypse; but Dionysius well knew that such a reference would have no force. It would have produced an effect contrary to what he intended. So he only speaks of *τίνες . . . τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*. Neither the Alogi nor Caius were outcasts of the church, but regular members. The former are reckoned *heretics* by some of the subsequent fathers, because they rejected the books of John. But when they did so, they did not, so far as we know, lose their standing at the time in the church.

Thus far, then, we have found among the churches, before the time of Dionysius, not a single testimony against the Apocalypse of a *historical* nature. Dionysius himself, we are quite certain, found nothing of this kind among them. But, inasmuch as we know that he still doubted the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse, on what grounds did he rest his doubts? On history or testimony as to facts, or only on subjective views and on reasoning from the manner and matter of the book? We must admit him to speak for himself.

In the sequel of the passage already cited from him, he declares that he durst not venture upon the rejection of the book (the Apocalypse), because many brethren have a high regard for it. He then proceeds thus: "But admitting that the comprehension of it is beyond my own understanding, I suppose there is some hidden and mysterious meaning throughout in its contents. For even though I do not understand it, still I suppose some deeper sense is couched in the words. Not measuring or judging these things by my own reason, but assigning more to faith, I attribute to it things higher than can be comprehended by me. I do not reject those things which I cannot comprehend; but they are more the objects of my wonder, because I do not perceive them."

It is easy to see, that Dionysius does not mean to revolt the Millena-

rians by a direct attack upon the book. He covers up, as it were, its supposed faults; and while he cautiously and warily suggests that it is unintelligible, he still seems to be willing to put this to the account of sacred mysteries.

In the sequel, says Eusebius, he goes through the whole work, showing that the *literal* sense is impossible. He then adds: "The prophet, having completed his whole prophecy, so to speak, congratulates both those who hold it fast, and also himself; for, Happy, says he, is every one who holds fast the words of the prophecy of this book, and I John, also, who saw and heard it." He then proceeds:

"*That the author was called* JOHN, *and that this composition is* JOHN'S, *I do not deny. I agree that it belongs to some holy and inspired man. I could not indeed concede that he was the apostle, the son of Zebedee, the brother of James, to whom belongs the Gospel according to John, and the catholic Epistle.* For I argue from the respective character of both writings, and from the kind of diction, and from the economy of the said book [the Apocalypse], that it is not his. For the evangelist nowhere inserts his own name, nor proclaims himself, neither in his Gospel nor in his Epistle. . . . John nowhere speaks of himself in the first person, nor in the third person; but the author of the Apocalypse immediately names himself in the outset: The Revelation of Jesus Christ, etc. . . . which he signified . . . to his servant John, etc. . . . Then he inscribes his epistle thus: John to the seven churches which are in Asia, Grace and Peace; [1: 4]. Moreover the evangelist did not prefix his name to his catholic epistle. . . . But the author of the Apocalypse did not deem it sufficient to name himself once, and then to declare what follows, but he again repeats: I John your brother, etc. [1: 9]. Besides this, at the close he has again expressed himself thus. . . . I John, who saw and heard these things [22: 8]. *That* JOHN *was the writer of this book, is to be believed on the ground of his own affirmation; but what John this was, is not clear.* For he does not say of himself, as oftentimes in the Gospel, that he was the beloved disciple of the Lord, or the brother of James, or an eye and ear witness of the Lord. Had he designed clearly to disclose himself, he would have said some of these things. Yet there is nothing of this; but he has called himself our brother and companion, and a witness of Jesus, and blessed because of his seeing and hearing the revelation.

"I suppose, moreover, that there are many of the same name with John the apostle, who because of their love toward him, and wonder, and emulation, and desire to be beloved of the Lord as he was, have given themselves the same name. In the like way, many a one among the children of the faithful is called *Paul*, and *Peter*. And besides this, there is another John in the Acts of the Apostles, surnamed *Mark*, whom

Barnabas and Paul took with them, concerning whom it is said: 'They had *John* for their minister.' Whether this is the person who wrote [the Apocalypse], I could not say; for it is not written, that he came with them into Asia. On the contrary, it is said: 'Paul and those with him, loosing from Paphos, came to Perga of Pamphylia; but John, departing from them, returned to Jerusalem;' [Acts 13: 13].

"*My belief is, that another John, among those who lived in Asia, was the author; inasmuch as the report is, that there are two sepulchral monuments in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of* JOHN.

"Moreover, from the thoughts and the words and the arrangement of them, this one [the author of the Apocalypse] may with probability be supposed to be different from that one [John the apostle]. For the Gospel and the Epistle harmonize well together, and they commence in the same manner. That says: In the beginning was the Word; this says: That which was from the beginning. That says: The Word became flesh, etc.; this exhibits the same things with slight changes: What we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, etc. . . . He remains consistent with himself, and never relinquishes his purpose.

"By the same leading thoughts and words he presents his views through the whole; examples of which we will now briefly produce. The careful reader will frequently find in each [viz. in the Gospel and the Epistle], *life, light, chasing away the darkness;* and continually occurs *truth, grace, flesh and blood of the Lord, judgment, forgiveness of sins, the love of God toward us,* the commandment that *we should love one another,* that *we should keep all the commandments, accusation of the world, of the devil, of antichrist, the promise of the Holy Spirit, adoption by God as sons, entire faith* required of us, everywhere *the Father and the Son.* In general, it is easy for those who distinguish traits, to see one and the same colouring both in the Gospel and in the Epistle. But the Apocalypse is exceedingly different, and quite foreign from this, neither touching nor even hardly approaching any of these things, nor having, so to speak, one syllable in common with them. Nor does the Epistle make any mention of the Apocalypse or reference to it, (for I omit the Gospel), nor the Apocalypse of the Epistle. Yet Paul, in his Epistles, makes mention even of his unwritten revelations.

"There is also a discrepancy between the language of the Gospel and Epistle, compared with that of the Apocalypse. Those are written not only without offence against the Greek idiom, but are most eloquent in their diction, modes of reasoning, and arrangement of expressions. We are far from finding in them any barbarism, or solecism, or any peculiar idiom. For the writer, as it seems, possessed by the grace of the Lord both gifts, viz. that of knowledge and of utterance. I will not deny, indeed, that the author of the Apocalypse saw a revelation, and received

knowledge and the gift of prophecy; *but I perceive that his diction and idiom is not accurate Greek, and that he uses barbarous expressions and solecisms.* It is unnecessary at present to cull out these; for it is not for the purpose of scoffing, (let no one suppose it), that I have said these things, but only in the way of examining the want of resemblance between those writings." (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VII. 25.)

I have thus exhibited the testimony of Dionysius at full length, so far as anything important to our question is concerned. Our inquiry now is: What is the amount of this testimony?

(1) Then, it is plain and clear, that Dionysius, while he recites the opinion of *τίνες . . . τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*, and doubtless means, by so doing, to intimate that objections against the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse are not altogether new and strange, still does not harmonize in opinion respecting the authorship of this book with those persons to whose views he adverts. He has no apprehension that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse. How could he entertain such an opinion, in view of what the church in general had believed respecting the book, and knowing, as he did, in what estimation Cerinthus was held, and what sentiments he had taught and defended—so incompatible with those of the Apocalypse? On the contrary, he doubts not that *John* was the author; probably, as he thinks, John the presbyter, but not John the apostle. He explicitly declares his belief in the *inspiration* of the writer; and therefore he must have regarded the book as properly sacred. Its mysterious tenor even, he does not bring forward as an objection to it, but with seeming reverence he wonders at that which surpasses his understanding. The ancients, to whom he refers as rejecting the work, made its mysterious manner and style a matter of objection and reproach. Dionysius, therefore, expressly exempts himself from harmonizing with them, either as to this objection, or as to their supposed author of the book. But,

(2) What then was his object, in expressing his *doubts* about the apostolic origin of the book? Clearly it must have had reference to the opinions of the Montanists respecting it, whose sentiments he so strongly opposed. They believed the book to have been written by the *apostle* John; and they too, for such were the current views of the times, regarded an *apostolic* origin, directly or indirectly, as being necessary to the highest authority of a book. It is plain, that this lies at the basis of Dionysius' argument. If he could show that the book was not written by the apostle John, then he would seem to abate in some degree the confidence that the Montanists reposed in it. To represent Dionysius as having no regard to this in his *Critique*, as some have recently done in order to give the more weight to his opinion, seems to me quite aside from the proper mark. Did the ancients, then, write critical reviews in such an

abstract way as they are written in modern times? Dionysius doubted, honestly as we may believe, the apostolic origin and authority of the book; but, as he says himself, he would not reject it from the Canon, because so many were zealously attached to it. So he has steered a kind of middle course. He speaks respectfully of the book; does not even find fault with its mysteries; allows the inspiration of the author; —and yet, he endeavours to undermine its real authority and influence; at least what he has said would do this at that time, in case it were fully admitted. He had a difficult part to act, and warily has he performed it.

(3) As to the rest; his own objections are mainly drawn from the diction, style, and manner of the book; the subjects treated of are but partially taken into the account. So far as his conjecture respecting John the presbyter as the author is concerned, I have discussed the subject in pp. 293 seq. above; and in pp. 289 seq. I have also discussed the objection founded on the frequent mention of the author's name in the Apocalypse, and the omission of it in the Gospel and Epistles. All the other arguments of Dionysius, drawn from the diction, the dialect, and the nature of the subjects introduced, etc., will be discussed in the sequel, and need not be introduced here with particularity. It must be acknowledged, that ecclesiastical antiquity presents us with few specimens indeed of more acute criticism than Dionysius exhibits. It shows with what attention he had read the works of John, and what powers of discrimination he possessed. But modern criticism has gone so far beyond this, that it would hardly be worth our while here to canvass at length the objections of Dionysius by themselves. He presents scarcely a tithe of the objections that now lie before us.

A few general remarks only it may be proper to make, at present, before we dismiss this witness. The accusation which the good father brings against the style of the Apocalypse, viz. that it is not *Hellenic*, and that it exhibits barbarisms and solecisms, is now somewhat better understood than it was in his day. Recent investigations have shown triumphantly, that there are not more than some two or three grammatical constructions in the whole book, if indeed so many, that cannot be vindicated by examples from even the better Grecian classics. The Commentary will show this; and I may be permitted to refer the reader to § 15 in the preceding pages, where the whole subject is discussed. That John does not conform altogether to classic usage in his style, is true; and the same is true of all the New Testament writers—true of John's Gospel and Epistles, the judgment of Dionysius to the contrary notwithstanding. They all write *Hebrew-Greek*. The thoughts and mode of exhibiting and arranging them, the imagery, the circle of movement—all, all is *Hebrew*. Only the *words* are Greek. If the Apocalypse *Hebraizes* more than any other New Testament book, (and

this I cheerfully concede), so it should do, and must do, written under such circumstances as it was, and following the Hebrew models before the writer's mind. And as Dionysius had no knowledge of Hebrew, and was comparatively but little familiar with the Jewish Scriptures, it is no wonder that he puts so much to the account of barbarism and poor Greek. He should however, as it seems to me, have been somewhat more modest on this point; at least we may think so, in case we are permitted to judge of his skill to criticise on Greek style, by the manner in which he himself writes Greek. Few of the Fathers are more *Alexandrine;* few present more harsh, difficult, and in some cases even doubtful, constructions than himself. The Apocalypse, at all events, need not shrink from comparison with his Greek.

The rest of his objections arise from the *words* and *thoughts* current in the Gospel and Epistle of John, but not to be found, as he says, in the Apocalypse. On this I merely remark, at present, that I do not see why a writer, who treats, at different times, of subjects almost entirely dissimilar, should always employ the same words or thoughts. I do not see why poetry and symbol may not have their appropriate costume. None but a merely mechanical writer always moves in the same circle. And beyond all this, Dionysius has greatly magnified the discrepancies between the Apocalypse and the other works of John. He has left wholly out of account the many, and (where the subjects admit) striking resemblances between them. He seems to have been far more intent on finding *discrepancies*, than on finding resemblances. Thorough criticism must attend to both.

Lücke takes it for granted, and so Kleuker also seems to decide, that Dionysius had, or could find, no good *historical* reasons for assigning the Apocalypse to the apostle John; and consequently that there were none in his time. But is not this making a conclusion much wider than the premises? Who was Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Methodius, and others, at or near the same period? And if little critical skill is to be attributed to some of these writers, what shall be said of *Origen*, who never once intimates that any doubts were extant about the authorship of the Apocalypse? Did he believe without any reason for it? He was no Millenarian. He held to nothing special that would lead him particularly to favour the Apocalypse. On what ground did he *undoubtingly* receive it?

Dionysius did not publish his work, or engage in his dispute with the Millenarians, until after the death of Origen. Consequently Origen could not know of the difficulties which the former had with the book. Origen doubtless knew that there had been some who rejected it; but he does not deem their objections of importance enough to be mentioned. Why now should so much importance be attached to Dionysius'

views, who was engaged in a warm dispute, and all of whose difficulties are *subjective* and not historical? What good reason is there for regarding his opinion as outweighing that of his teacher and of all his contemporaries? That a warm dispute may influence the opinion of an honest, talented, and even enlightened man, is sufficiently plain from Luther's judgment about the *epistola straminea*. Why should we feel any surprise, that Dionysius, apprehending that he could produce some specious reasons, judged it meet by the use of them to undermine, or at least to lessen, the authority to which his antagonists appealed? The softness of his manner is certainly worthy of all commendation; but it may well be doubted, I think, whether he ever would have thought of assailing the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse, if he had never heard of Nepos' book, and never engaged in dispute with his followers.

Thus far, then, we have not a particle of *historic* testimony against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; and thus far we have pointed, and direct, and often repeated testimony in its favour. And when it is alleged, in order to rebut this, that we do not know whether one and another of the fathers, who testify in its favour, derive their opinion from mere hearsay, or from critical examination, I confess I do not well understand what to make of this. What book of the New Testament is there, of which the very same thing may not be said? Yea, of which it has not been said? In what particular way the fathers of the second and following centuries obtained their information and made up their minds, we have no means of ascertaining. One thing, however, is certain. After the first century, all information becomes traditional, except that which the New Testament books themselves contain. The fragments of some other writers during that period may indeed be consulted; but they do not, and cannot, speak much in relation to such a subject. Beyond these, from Justin Martyr onward, opinion must have been *traditional*. But a general, an all but universal tradition, constant, invariable, is the best and the main evidence we have of the genuineness of many of the most important ancient writings. I cannot perceive the fairness, then, or even the relevancy of remarks of this nature, in respect to such men as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and others. If there be anything important in such allegations, then there is that in them which will shake the basis on which rests the genuineness of all the New Testament books. What one of them is there, that has not been doubted by some? And how can its real authenticity be established, if we may scatter over all the testimony in its favour the mists of doubt and uncertainty? There is scarcely one of the whole, which has more confident and unequivocal testimony in its favour than the Apocalypse. And if this testimony is unworthy of credit, then where at last shall we land, in pursuing such a course, except at the metropolis of universal doubt and skepticism?

Beyond Dionysius in the third century, and onward in the fourth, we cannot expect to find anything more than a mere repetition of what had gone before. No new *facts* could be developed; and we meet with no new views, which are worth particular discussion. But still, for the satisfaction of the reader, and for the sake of fully holding up both sides of the question, the doubts of others after the time of Dionysius must be produced.

(4) Opinion of Eusebius.

I shall not commence an account of this, as C. F. Schmid does, by an attack on the character and credit of Eusebius as a critic. That he had more historical than philological knowledge, is indeed plain enough. But this is equally plain of most of the fathers. I cannot think that any man of candour can well sit down to a general reading of Eusebius, without giving him great credit for candour also, and likewise for sincerity, and in general for sobriety. There is nothing in him which shows that he was an enthusiast, except perhaps on the point of martyrdom. It has sometimes struck me, that Eusebius would have given up the Apocalypse as uncanonical, had he not seen in it so much of Christian zeal and special regard for the honour and reward of martyrs.

He has spoken of the Apocalypse in several places; but always indecisively. We can easily discern, however, the real state of his mind, notwithstanding his apparent indecision. Thus in Ecc. Hist. III. 24, in speaking of the Evangelists, he mentions the Apocalypse, in connection with the apostle John, in the following manner: *Τῆς δ' Ἀποκαλύψεως ἐφ' ἑκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλκεται ἡ δόξα· ὅμως γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μαρτυρίας ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ τὴν ἐπίκρισιν δέξεται καὶ αὐτή*, i. e. 'The opinion respecting the Apocalypse is even at present fluctuating. However, at some appropriate time we will pass our judgment upon it, as it respects the testimony of the ancients.'

Nothing then is here decided. But in the next chapter (III. 25), after speaking of acknowledged books of the Acts and Epistles, he goes on to say: "To these may be added, if it seem good (*εἰ φανείη*), the Apocalypse of John; concerning which we shall set forth past opinions, in due time. These [the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse] are among the *ὁμολογούμενοι*, i. e. the universally acknowledged [books]." He then goes on to mention several books that are among the *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*, i. e. those which are denied or gainsayed, and immediately subjoins: "And moreover, as I said, the Apocalypse of John [may be added], if it seem good (*εἰ φανείη*), which, as I have remarked, some reject, but others reckon it among the acknowledged books."

Here then we have, I apprehend, a true picture of the mind of Eusebius. He is not clear enough in his own views to make the *ἐπίκρισιν*

which he had promised in the preceding chapter. He merely leaves the reader to take his choice; intimating, at the same time, that precedent is not wanting for either side of the question. But what the precedent is; who they are that believe or disbelieve; how many of either side; when, where;—of all this, not a word here. In another passage, as we shall see, he has in part redeemed his promise, by giving the opinion of some who preceded him against the Apocalypse; although even here he does not give us the promised ἐπίκρισις. We will examine it, after one or two more extracts.

In III. 39, Eusebius treats of Papias and his works. In the Ἐξήγησις of this latter writer, Eusebius says that he speaks of several apostles, among whom is John the evangelist; "Then," says Eusebius, "making a distinction in his narration, he arranges another John with other persons who do not belong to the number of the apostles, placing before him a certain Aristion; and he expressly names him [this John] the *presbyter*. So that in this way it seems to be shown, that a true story is told by those, who say that there were two persons in Asia who were called by the same name; and moreover, that there are two sepulchral monuments at Ephesus, each of which bears the name of John. To this one ought to give heed; for it is probable that the second [John], unless one should insist on the first, saw the apocalyptic vision which bears the name of John."

Still vacillating. *Εἰ μή τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον.* But what if one should prefer the *first* John? Why then he may suit himself, as Eusebius would seem to say, and leave others to have their choice. Quite an accommodation to a certain class of minds!

In VII. 25, he treats specially and at some length of the Apocalypse. The reader expects of course, that he will here redeem his promise made in III. 24. But all which he does is to give an extract from Dionysius' work (already above exhibited), which work adverts to the opinions of those who had lived before him, and also gives the opinion of the author. It is unnecessary again to repeat the words of Dionysius here. Eusebius has however added no ἐπίκρισις, even in this last passage; still practising the same reserve. Yet from the manner in which he cites and occasionally comments on Dionysius, it is plain enough that his critical judgment was inclined to take part with him. He could not well solve the doubts which Dionysius had raised. Besides; he was a strong Antimillenarian, and as the Chiliasts had made the Apocalypse their principal authority, from Papias down to the time of Eusebius, he probably felt less regret at parting with this book, than he would at parting with almost any other book of the New Testament. Still, he had great respect for Origen and many others, who, as he knew, had fully admitted the authenticity of the book. He was very reluc-

tant, also, as Dionysius seems to have been, to hurt the feelings of the great mass of Christians, who beyond all doubt regarded the apostle John as its author. Hence the apparent vacillation of his opinion. The truth seems to be, that his critical judgment inclined him toward the views of Dionysius, while his feelings and his respect for others carried him in an opposite direction.

When he is speaking without reference to matters of criticism, he speaks as nearly all other writers of his time do, i. e. he refers to the Apocalypse as a divine book and as the work of the apostle John. E. g. in Ecc. Hist. III. 29, he is speaking of the heresy of the Nicolaitans, and says, among other things, that "the Apocalypse of John makes mention of it, *ἧς δὴ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις μνημονεύει.*" In Vit. Const. III. 33, he speaks of Jerusalem as built anew by Constantine, and says, that "this is perhaps that new Jerusalem celebrated in the prophetic writings; in respect to which long discourses pronounce innumerable eulogies, speaking prophetically by the divine Spirit." There can be no good ground to doubt, in the first case, that John there means the *apostle;* nor in the second, that Eusebius refers to the description of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse.

In his Demonstrat. Evangelicae (p. 386 ed. Colon.), speaking of Christ he says, that "he did not come to seal up prophetic vision; for he, of old, opened and disclosed the dark and sealed prophecies, removing the seals put on them, giving to his disciples the meaning of the divine Scriptures; whence it is said: Lo! the Lion of the tribe of Judah hath overcome, and he hath opened the seals put upon the book; *according to the Apocalypse of John.*"

In III. 18, Ecc. Hist. he is speaking of the banishment of the apostle John to Patmos; and, in connection with a reference to a passage in Irenaeus about the mysterious number 666, he speaks of it as "*ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου λεγομένῃ Ἀποκαλύψει, in the Revelation called John's.*" Once more, in his Chronicon (p. 208 edit. Scal.), he speaks of John's banishment to Patmos, and adds: *Ἔνθα τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑώρακεν, ὡς δηλοῖ Εἰρηναῖος*, i. e. 'where he saw the apocalyptic vision, as Irenaeus shows.' By here employing the word *δηλοῖ* instead of *φησί*, he evidently implies an assent to what Irenaeus declares; although at other times he doubted what he here yields.

The reader will call to mind, that the testimony of Eusebius, if such it may be called, is a full half century after that of Dionysius. In the early part of the fourth century, (the period in which Eusebius flourished), we hear no more of doubts from others than Eusebius, about the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. Victorinus of Petavium, Pamphilus of Caesarea (Apol. pro. Orig., Orig. Opp. IV. p. 39, 40), Methodius of Olympus, Lactantius, Tichonius, Commodian, Athanasius, and others

who lived at or very near the period of Eusebius, speak but one language. The doubts of Eusebius himself never amounted, as we have seen, to anything like a full and assured persuasion. Neither Eusebius nor Dionysius, although both believed in the *spiritual* exegesis, i. e. the tropical meaning of many Scriptures, appears to have been sufficiently expert, in the application of the principle, to remove the difficulties they had about Chiliasm. Their opposition to this seems plainly to have had an influence on their opinion about the book, to which the Chiliasts principally appealed. But Origen, Methodius, and others, found no embarrassment here. And generally—may we not even say universally?—at this period, when the Montanist party had become small and had but little influence; when, moreover, the question of *Chiliasm* had ceased to excite any special interest in the churches, inasmuch as the battle had been fought and won in Egypt by the party opposed to it, and the churches in general had finally deemed it best to let every one think for himself in respect to this matter; all opposition to the Apocalypse either ceased, or became quite inactive and indifferent. Eusebius, who was employed in looking up the history of by-gone ages, seems to stand solitary and unsupported at his time by any of the writers now extant, in regard to difficulties about the origin of the book before us.

(5) Later doubts concerning the Apocalypse.

Although during the lifetime of Eusebius we find no distinguished writer participating in his doubts, yet at a subsequent period, during the latter half of the fourth century, there appears, in parts of the oriental church, to have been scruples in regard to this book, which in some cases amounted well nigh if not entirely to such a pitch, as to occasion an effort to exclude it from the Canon. It is necessary briefly to advert to these, in order to render our canonical history of this book more complete.

The leading men of this period, viz. Athanasius, Ephrem Syrus, Hilary of Poictiers, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzen, Ambrose of Milan, Chrysostom, Philastrius Brixiensis, Ruffinus, Basil, probably Gregory of Nyssa, the Council of Hippo 393, and of Carthage 397, all speak in favour of the Apocalypse; and nearly all of them in language so decided, as to admit of no possible doubt as to their opinion. But some exceptions from these have been made and confidently urged; and candour demands that some proper notice should be taken of this.

Gregory of Nazianzen composed a piece in verse, which exhibits a catalogue of the canonical Scriptures; Opp. II. p. 98. In this he omits the Apocalypse. The passage may be seen, by referring back to § 17. I. No. 25 above; where the subject itself of the like omissions, at this period, is discussed at length, and the bearing of such occurrences ex-

amined, in reference to the point before us. A comparison of Nos. 20 and 25 (ib.) will place before the reader the principal part of what I could wish to say on the present occasion, and it need not be repeated here. It seems indeed quite plain, that in many places in the East, in order to guard against Montanism and Chiliasm, the bishops omitted to read the Apocalypse in public, and withdrew the book from the number of those which were commonly circulated. It is in view of this, that Gregory of Nyssa speaks of the Apocalypse as being *ἐν ἀποκρύφοις*, (see p. 330 above); while he still calls it, in another place (ib.), *ἡ τελευταία τῆς χάριτος βίβλος*, clearly acknowledging its authenticity here, as he does its apostolic origin in the preceding passage to which I have just referred. In like manner the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite, (a writer probably of this late period), calls the Apocalypse *τὴν κρυφίαν καὶ μυστικὴν ἐποψίαν*, i. e. the hidden and mystical vision; see p. 330 above. But above all, the case of Philastrius of Brixia (fl. 380) illustrates this whole matter. In his book De Haeres. c. 88, he exhibits a list of the books to be read in the churches, omitting both the epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. Yet in the same work (c. 60), he says expressly that "they are *heretics*, who do not receive the Gospel of John and his Apocalypse." Again in c. 88, he speaks of "*Scripturae absconditae*, which ought to be read by advanced Christians, but not by all;" see p. 330 above, for the more complete exhibition of this matter.

In these examples, now, we see very plainly the prevailing tendency and fashion of the oriental churches in regard to this matter. Hence it came about, that so few copies of the Apocalypse are to be found, even in after times, in the Mss. of the Greek and oriental churches. Mill has stated a fact in regard to this, which ought here to be particularly noticed. He says: "The Apocalypse was joined neither with the volume of the Gospels or of the Epistles; but, as a *prophetic* book consisting of matter entirely different from the others, it stood by itself. Hence that ancient distinction of the New Testament into *λόγια Εὐαγγελίων, Ἀποστόλων, καὶ Ἀποκάλυψις*." Millii Proleg. No. 226. We know, moreover, that there were three different ways of classifying the books of the New Testament, which prevailed more or less among the ancients, and specially in the 4th century. The *first* method has reference merely to public use and reading, as just stated above. It calls those *canonical* which are thus read; and others not read, although admitted to be divine, are *ἀπόκρυφοι*. The *second* held all the canonical books to be inspired, but no others; and of course might be, and was, a larger canon than the first. *Apocryphal*, with this class, was equivalent to *spurious*. So Athanasius, Sophronius, Jerome, and others. A third party had reference only to the supposed critical judgment of the church, i. e. of a majority of the church, and decided the character of a book on this

ground. Eusebius seems to have belonged to this class; and Amphilochus, also, in some verses to be mentioned in the sequel. (See C. F. Schmid's Offenbar. Johannis, §§ 27, 28 seq.). Hence it is very plain, that no certain conclusion from this or that passage, in relation to the subject before us, can be well and accurately drawn, without an inquiry into the mode of classification which the writer adopts, and some proper investigation of the ground and object of his judgment. To apply the word *ἀπόκρυφοι* undistinguishingly to the designation of certain books, at this period, in the same sense in which it was afterwards used, and is now employed among us, would be to betray a want of knowledge in regard to the usages of the fourth century, in particular of the latter half of it.

In respect to Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Philastrius, enough has been said in the preceding paragraphs, and on pages 329, 330 above, to show that a proper distinction between the books for public and ordinary reading, and those which, as Philastrius says, "legi debent morum causa a *perfectis*, non ab omnibus legi debent" (p. 330 above), will easily and naturally account for the omission of the Apocalypse in catalogues of canonical books designed for common and public use. In regard to Gregory of Nazianzen and Philastrius, it is not possible to admit any other explanation than the one given, without making them grossly inconsistent with themselves and even contradictory. Gregory of Nyssa has made the meaning and explanation of *ἀπόκρυφοι*, in that quarter of the church where most doubt seems to have prevailed respecting the Apocalypse, so plain and intelligible, that I do not see any good room for hesitation. Let us see, now, whether the same principle which must be here admitted, is not applicable to other cases, in which the writers are appealed to as doubting or denying the apostolic origin and authority of the Apocalypse.

The 60th (59?) Canon of the Council of Laodicea in Phrygia, A. D. 363 (367?), has been a standing authority among those who doubt the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. This was but a small Council, and it was held in a region where doubts seem to have been more common than elsewhere. The genuineness of this 60th Canon was called in question by Spittler, and its credit, for a while, was given up by most critics. But Bickell (Stud. und Krit. 1830, p. 591 seq.) seems to have rendered the matter somewhat doubtful, and to have left it in this position. Without going at all here into the question of its genuineness, (for the discussion of which there is no room), I will concede, that the 60th Canon, i. e. the one in question, *omits* the Apocalypse in the catalogue of the sacred books; just as Gregory Nazianzen and Philastrius omit it. But does this decide, that the bishops convened in this Council rejected the Revelation as a spurious book? Surely not, under

such circumstances as have been described. And indeed there is something more to be said in this case, that may serve to cast further light upon it. The Council of Constantinople in 692 admits the Canon of books named by the Council of Laodicea, and also that named by the Council of Carthage in 397. Now the latter unequivocally admits the Apocalypse as a divine book. In what manner, then, did the bishops at Constantinople reconcile their admission of both Canons? There seems to be no explanation of this so probable, as the one which allows, that, while the Council of Laodicea do not include the Apocalypse in their *public* canon, they still are not to be understood as casting away the book. Another circumstance favours this supposition. No subsequent ecclesiastical writer appeals to the Council of Laodicea as authority for neglecting the Apocalypse; and in the Arabic version of the 60th Canon, the Apocalypse is named among the canonical books, as it is in some of the Latin versions. More especially may we be disposed not to be bound by the Council of Laodicea, inasmuch as it includes Baruch and the epistle of Jeremiah among the canonical books of the Old Testament.

In like manner the so-called Canons of the Apostles, (a supposititious work of the latter part of Cent. IV.), are appealed to as omitting the Apocalypse. In Canon 76 (85), we have a list of sacred books which does indeed omit it; but it inserts Judith, three books of the Maccabees, and two epistles of Clement. This circumstance stamps its character. The whole work is itself a fiction; and the omission of the Apocalypse shows, that it must have probably originated at the time, when it was not uncommon to omit this book in canons for public use. See in Cotel. Pat. Apostol. I. p. 429 seq.

Amphilochus, bishop of Iconium (fl. 380), an intimate friend of Basil and of Gregory Nazianzen, wrote some Iambics addressed to Seleucus, which are printed in Opp. Greg. Nazianz. II. p. 194 seq., and have, by some, been attributed to Gregory. The verses in question contain a catalogue of the canonical books; and of the Apocalypse they speak in the following manner: *Τὴν δ' Ἀποκάλυψιν τὴν Ἰωάννου πάλιν Τίνες μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δέ γε Νόθον λέγουσιν*, i. e. 'some admit moreover the Apocalypse of John, but most persons say it is spurious.' The friend of Gregory has seemingly gone much further than Gregory himself, who, in his catalogue, merely passes the book in silence, although he elsewhere plainly recognizes it as a book of authority. Amphilochus, as it would seem, must in all probability have rejected it. On what grounds—we are left entirely to conjecture. Possibly he doubted of it for reasons like to those which Dionysius has given, the force of which Eusebius seems so much to have felt.

One more writer of this class, of some active eminence in his time,

(flor. 360, † 386), is Cyrill of Jerusalem. In his Catecheses, (Cat. IV. 36), he exhibits a catalogue of the canonical books, and omits the Apocalypse. At the close of his list he says: *τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ*, i. e. 'let all the remaining [books] be placed without among the secondary ones.' Lücke (p. 335) thinks this is decisive, that Cyrill absolutely rejected as spurious the Apocalypse; and particularly because he does not elsewhere quote from this book. But this last circumstance is not decisive. His works are not numerous; and in general his Catecheses are not of such a nature as would lead him to quote this book. It was for a long time denied that Chrysostom had made any use of the Apocalypse; but this at last is amply established, although his use of it is very unfrequent. But Cyrill, an ardent man, may well be supposed, in composing catechetical i. e. doctrinal instructions, not to have had occasion to cite the Apocalypse often, if at all, even in case he believed in its authenticity. Montanism still existed in the East, and Chiliasm, (which of course accompanied Montanism but also existed independent of it), had taken root in many places and maintained its ground; as may be seen in the works of Lactantius and others in the fourth century. What Cyrill says of *Antichrist*, and of *another* head of the dragon, (Cat. XV. 12 seq. and 27), must be admitted, to say the least, to refer to the Apocalypse as a well known book. But what he says of the period of three and a half years, the appointed time of Antichrist, where he remarks: *οὐκ ἐξ ἀποκρύφων λέγομεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Δανιήλ* (ib. 13), looks very much like declining to appeal to the Apocalypse for confirmation of his views about this period. Still it is not quite certain that we ought to give it this interpretation; for he may have chosen the books publicly read as preferable authority for those whom he addressed, while he regarded the Apocalypse as among the *ἀπόκρυφοι*, in the same way as did Gregory of Nyssa, Philastrius, and Gregory Nazianzen. Positive evidence of rejection cannot be found in him, or at least has not yet been produced. Besides, let any one read through Cat. XV. and he will see, that while Cyrill, in conformity with his directions about the Canon in Cat. IV. 36, declines openly to cite the Apocalypse, yet he has borrowed its language in some cases beyond all question; e. g. Cat. XV. 13, where he says of the fourth beast, *αὐτὸς ὄγδοος βασιλεύσει*, which can be found only in Rev. 17: 11, and is so peculiar as to make the quotation certain. So Cat. XV. 22 looks altogether like being modified by Rev. 1: 7, although the quotation may be from Zech. 12: 10—12. In the same place, we have an expression which the enemies of Christ will utter: *ποῦ φύγωμεν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς ὀργῆς σου*;—almost an exact copy of Rev. 6: 16, but possibly based upon Nah. 1: 6. The index to Cyrilli Opp. Omn.

pp. 437, 440 will show the certainty that Cyrill has not unfrequently, *sub rosa*, referred to this book.

Thus it would appear, on the whole, that during the last half of the fourth century, there was a shyness among many of the eastern bishops in respect to the Apocalypse, even in some cases where the other *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*, viz. James, 2 Peter, 2d and 3d John, were admitted; e. g. as in the case of Cyrill of Jerusalem, of the Council at Laodicea (363), of the author of the Apostolical Canons, and of others. Jerome, who lived many years in Palestine and must have known the state of things, testifies to this, in some remarks which he makes on the epistle to the Hebrews. "If," says he, "the usage of the Latins does not receive it [the epistle to the Hebrews] among the canonical Scriptures, *nec Graecorum quidem ecclesiae Apocalypsin eodem libertate suscipiunt*, i. e. neither, by the same liberty, do the churches of the Greeks receive the Apocalypse." He then goes on to remark, that contrary to recent usage (hujus temporis), and following the authority of the *ancient* writers, he receives both. It is quite plain from this, that he was acquainted with the state of things at this period among the oriental churches, as it has been set forth in the preceding pages. There can be no rational doubt, that there was a great variety of shades of opinion among those churches. Some men were in the hesitating and vacillating state of Eusebius; others, not improbably, may have declined to acknowledge John the apostle as the author, in the manner of Dionysius. Others may have rejected it from their canon; of which, however, there is no positive evidence, in case we take *canonical* in the sense of Jerome, i. e. as meaning an *inspired* book. Nothing is more likely than all this, if we contemplate the state of things as exhibited above, in connection with the declaration of Jerome.

Let us now follow on, somewhat further, this state of things among the oriental churches. But before we do this, it is proper to advert to the fact, that the Greek churches were *far from being unanimous*, in regard to the doubts and difficulties which have just been laid before the reader. We have seen above, under No. I., that Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus (connected with the eastern Asiatic churches), Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others, had no hesitation about appealing to the Apocalypse as a divine book; although, from the nature of its contents, most of them appeal to it but seldom. Chrysostom, for example, has written no Homilies upon it; and seldom is it made the basis of any sort of discourse by others. Most writers seem to have felt doubts about the meaning of various parts of the book; and while this was the case, it would naturally be left out of view, in the same way as the Canticles are, at the present time, by most of our public teachers. It is not difficult, therefore, to ac-

count for the general silence of the oriental churches, at this period, in regard to a book so mysterious, and the subject of doubt to a Eusebius and a Dionysius. The use which the Montanists and all the Chiliasts made of it, was also a ground, as we may reasonably believe, for keeping it back in some measure from the churches, and for omitting it, as we have seen, in the list of Scriptures to be publicly read.

A state of things like this could not be expected to come speedily to an end. We are able to obtain, however, but rather an imperfect view of the succeeding century, in respect to the question before us. As a matter of critical interest, indeed, it would not be of any serious avail either for or against the Apocalypse. What has so late an age to do with the furnishing of evidence that can be relied upon, in regard to either side of the question? It is more a matter of literary curiosity, to follow further the history of the Apocalypse, than of any importance in a critical respect.

The testimony of various writers belonging to the Greek church at this period has already been adverted to, in p. 357 above. There is not the least doubt of the most full and ample recognition of the Apocalypse by Cyrill of Alexandria, De Adorat. VI. p. 188; by Nilus of Constantinople, De Orat. 69. 75, 76; Isidore of Pelusium, Epist. II. 175. I. 188. I. 13; Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia (see p. 305 above), who wrote a Commentary on the book, which is the oldest we have excepting that of Victorinus; Arethas, probably his successor, who also wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, and most fully admitted its claims, although he refers (in the introduction) to some who had doubted them.

How Theodore of Mopsuestia, who seems of late to have come into high repute, decided in respect to the Apocalypse, we do not know. Lücke (p. 347) thinks it probable that he was adverse to it, because he rejected the epistle of James, and withal was not favourably inclined to the Antilegomeni. Theodoret of Antioch, the commentator, wrote upon Daniel and many other books; yet only two or three references have been found in him to the Apocalypse. From these, nothing against the Apocalypse can be made out, but rather in favour of it. Yet the fact of his silence, (much like that of Chrysostom), shows that whatever his views were of the Apocalypse, he did not choose to make it an object of frequent and familiar reference. This would not prove that he had doubts about the authorship of the book; but only that he regarded it as mysterious and difficult of explication; just as Chrysostom seems to have done, whose opinion of its genuineness is clear and certain. As a general thing, the *Antiochian* school and region, at that period, i. e. after 350 and so into the next century, were little inclined to bring forward the Apocalypse. Hence they produced no commentaries or homilies

upon it. It can hardly be doubted, therefore, that this book was at least regarded by the leading men of that region, as less useful than most other sacred books.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, (an Alexandrian of Cent. VI.), does not refer to the Apocalypse, in his Topog. Christ.; although it would seem that he had inducements to do so, in book VII. respecting the duration of the heavens. The Synod of Trulla (692) received the Canon of Laodicea (363) which *omits* the Apocalypse; the Canones Apostolicae do the same (p. 360 above); while, at the same time, the Canons of the African Synods, at the close of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century, all *include* the Apocalypse. Much has been said upon these occurrences, and conclusions have been drawn from them both for and against the Apocalypse. But we have seen that the matter in respect to the Council of Laodicea is doubtful; and of course it is doubtful what was done at Trulla. Whether it was oversight or design in the Synod, as to the omission of the Apocalypse, (supposing them to have omitted it), it would be difficult to say. If it was *design*, it would seem probable, that the members of the Council of Trulla meant to leave the reception or omission of the Apocalypse to the judgment of the respective churches or bishops. In the like way did the Synod at Nice in 787 decide.

In the eighth century, Johannes Damascenus fully admitted the Apocalypse; while Nicephorus, of the ninth, adheres to the Synod of Laodicea, i. e. omits it. In periods after this, individuals and books may be met with, here and there, which seem to express doubts about the Apocalypse; but the general current was undoubtedly in its favour.

Let us now return from this view of the *Greek* church, followed down to a period far beyond any critical importance, back to the WESTERN CHURCH and see whether any opposition was there made to the Apocalypse. And here all is clear. After the fourth century began, all the writers of influence move in one direction. Thus Hilary, Ambrose, Ticonius, Julius Firmicus Maternus, Philastrius, the Synod of Hippo (393), the third Synod of Carthage (397), Innocent bishop of Rome, Augustine, Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, Gelasius Papa, and still later, Primasius, Junilius Africanus, the Synod of Toledo—all these and many others, decide without any doubt or hesitation for the Apocalypse. And although some of those here named advert to doubts, (e. g. the two last named), yet no weight appears to be attached to them. In the eighth and ninth centuries, here and there a case of doubt may be found in the western churches; but such cases seem to have been so local and temporary as to produce no influence in checking the mighty current, all of which, in this region, ran in one direction.

Turn we now to the SYRIAN CHURCHES, the eastern part of which

may be separated from the oriental Greek churches as not speaking the same language. It is now generally acknowledged, that the *Peshito* or first Syriac Version of the New Testament was probably made in the second century, or at least early in the third. Ewald places it still earlier (Apoc. p. 60), as do some others; while a different class assign it to a later period than that just named; but the most probable statement seems to be that which I have made. It has often been urged, and is still urged, as an unanswerable argument against the Apocalypse, that it is omitted in the Peshito, and has continued to be so in the Mss. copies, down to the present hour.

If this objection be conclusive, then it extends in like manner to the 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, and the epistle of Jude, which are all omitted.

The Syrian churches have ever cherished a high veneration for this version; as indeed they had reason to do, on account of its excellence. But when they attribute it even to the *apostolic* age, as they often do, we may admire their zeal rather than their critical judgment. The first certain traces of its use are in Ephrem Syrus' Commentaries, who flourished in the latter part of Cent. IV, at the same period with those Greek fathers brought to view above, who had doubts and difficulties about the Apocalypse. With these, it is clear, Ephrem did not sympathize, as his works abundantly prove; see under § 17. I. No. 21 above. From some source in *Syriac* it is clear that he must have obtained his references to the Apocalypse; for it seems to be certain, that he did not himself understand the Greek; see Sozom. Hist. Ecc. III. 16. Theod. Hist. Ecc. IV. 29. Hug's Introd. I. § 65, p. 205. Yet he refers familiarly to the Apocalypse, as though his readers would have no more question about it, than they would about his reference to other books of Scripture. This fact is one of much importance. To account for it Eichhorn and Hug resort to the supposition, that the Peshito originally contained the Apocalypse; and that afterwards, in consequence of the doubts in the Greek churches about this book, and because it was not read in the churches, it was omitted. Kolthoff (Apoc. Vindic. p. 27) seems to favour the same opinion. But, with Lücke (p. 320), I must regard this as improbable. It may easily and readily be supposed, that the Lectionaries would omit it; but that all the copies should have agreed in this, considering the high value set upon the version, can hardly be deemed probable. Be this however as it may, the facts remain. Ephrem quotes the Apocalypse, and not unfrequently. He quotes it unhesitatingly as a divine and acknowledged book. Whence did he obtain these views of it? The manner in which he quotes it shows, that there must have been a Syriac version before him. It shows also that this was well known to his readers, for whom his writings are intended. Were this otherwise, he must have said something concern-

ing the matter. *When*, and *by whom*, was this version made? These are questions that we cannot answer. It must have been made for some time, in order to gain such a currency and confidence; and the fact that Ephrem appeals to the book in such a manner, is good security for the reputation of the Apocalypse itself in that quarter of the church. If Ephrem did so, would not others do the same among the Syrian churches? The Syrian churches entertained the highest respect for him. They even named him *prophet* and *interpreter* of the divine word. His works were many of them soon translated into Greek; and Jerome assures us (IV. p. 126), that such was his reputation, that 'in some of the churches his books were publicly read, after the lection of the Scriptures.' Probably these were his Commentaries, on the passages of Scripture that were read. All this shows a state of things far from being unfavourable to the Apocalypse, in that quarter of the church; it shows also, that there must have been a Syriac version of this book at that time in use.

'But the Peshito does not contain it. What but the rejection of the divine authority of the book can account for this?'

The problem may be solved in various ways. The person who made the Peshito version, doubtless made it, in the first instance, for public use in the churches. Such was the immediate purpose for which nearly all the primitive versions of the New Testament were made; see Augusti, Denkwürd. VI. p. 118. An indubitable proof that such was the case with the Peshito, is, that it exhibits a pretty complete notation of the Anagnosmata which belong only to public use. The translator may have designed only to furnish the churches with such a book. Or he may have died and left his work unfinished. And besides these suppositions, there is still another and an important attitude of the case. It is a well known fact, and now generally conceded, that the New Testament, *as a whole*, did not assume its present form until the latter part of the second century, i. e. it was not collected into one body, and regarded as one work, before this period. How easy now to suppose, that the author of the Peshito Version did not obtain a complete copy, but only a *church-copy*, i. e. a Lectionary. Mill, in speaking of the custom of the early ages in respect to the copies of the New Testament says: "Neque Apocalypsis vel Evangelico vel Epistolico Codici juncta erat; sed, tanquam Propheticus Liber, diversi prorsus a reliquis argumenti, seorsim incedebat; unde vetus illa distinctio librorum N. Test., in *Εναγγελίων, Ἀποστόλων, καὶ Ἀποκαλύψεως λόγια*, apud Origenem, Comm. in Matt. p. 220." We have seen already, among the Greek churches, extensive evidences of such a practice. The state of Mss. which have come down to us, shows that such usages prevailed. Who does not know, that very few copies of the Apocalypse have yet been

found, and how much behind the other books, as to a correct text, this book still remains? There are so many phenomena of this kind, that we cannot be mistaken in supposing, that even where the Apocalypse was fully admitted as a sacred book, it was comparatively but little used and little copied. Even the Philoxenian version, made in 508 by Polycarp at the request of Philoxenus, and corrected in 616 by Thomas of Heraclea, although it originally embraced the Apocalypse, as it is conceded, is still rarely to be found associated with this book in the Mss. Thus the best exemplar of White, in his Versio Philox., did not contain the Apocalypse; Pref. p. 22. The three Syriac Mss. in the Royal Library at Paris, although derived from the Jacobites who admit the Apocalypse even in their public lections, do not contain this book; Schmid's Offenbarung, p. 161. Moses Mardenus, sent to Europe by Ignatius patriarch of Antioch in 1552, in order to get the Syriac New Testament printed, brought no Ms. containing the Apocalypse; while, at the same time, he assured those who inquired of him, that the Apocalypse, and the Epistles, which are omitted in the Peshito, were regarded by the Syrians as divine. Afterwards he sent a copy of these books to Europe, which was printed by Lud. de Dieu, and has been followed by the Polyglots and the common Syriac New Testaments. But down to the present time it does not seem to be settled, whether the copy of the Apocalypse in question belonged to the Philoxenian version, or was derived from another source; for Mardenus did not give the source from which he derived his copy.

It would seem, then, that even the Philoxenian, as well as the Peshito, is usually found without the Apocalypse; and yet we know that the Jacobites and others who admit this, do not reject the authority of the Apocalypse. In such a state of things, we cannot make much out of the omission of the Apocalypse in the Peshito; for all the copies of which we know anything, are later than the period when Ephrem lived. That the ancient *eastern* Syrian church rejected the Apocalypse from the Canon, there is no good evidence whatever. That the very ancient *western* Syrian church admitted its claims, is clear from the views of Theophilus of Antioch; see p. 312 above. From the manner in which Ephrem treats the book, the evidence is conclusive that in his time it was fully credited. Even more than this it seems necessary to suppose. How could he speak as he does about it, had he known that it was doubted, or newly admitted, or held in a vacillating position by his church? Lücke himself acknowledges, that nothing of any consequence *against* the book can be made out from the circumstance of its omission in the Peshito; Einl. p. 321. There is not a shadow of doubt, moreover, that when the Philoxenian Version was made, the Apocalypse was admitted as canonical by the Syrian churches. And if the Apoc-

alypse attached to the editions of our printed Syriac Testaments, is still older than the Philoxenian Version, (a thing quite credible), the point is equally clear in regard to the credit of the book at the time when that older version was made; for its title attributes the work to John, at the time when he was banished by Nero to Patmos.

Thus have we taken a survey of the Greek, the Latin, and the Syrian churches, in search of objections against the authenticity of the Apocalypse. And WHAT, AND HOW MUCH, HAVE WE FOUND? The answer to these questions requires separate and distinct notice.

§ 18. *Result of historical testimony.*

If we include in this what the book says of the author, as has been done above, we find a series of testimony and tradition, occasionally called in question or opposed by few indeed, and but for a little time, until we come down to the latter part of the fourth century. Of the second century, Papias, Justin Martyr, Melito of Sardis, Apollonius, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, the Testament of the XII. Patriarchs, Tertullian, Irenaeus, are leading witnesses. In the third, Methodius, Hippolytus, the Epistle of the Romish Clergy to Cyprian in 250, Victorinus Petavionensis, Commodianus, Cyprian, Origen, Nepos, all testify in its favour. In the fourth century, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Ephrem Syrus, Athanasius, Didymus of Alexandria, Macarius, the Donatists, the third council at Carthage, Prudentius, Hilary, Ambrose, Philastrius, Ruffin, Jerome, Lactantius, Julius Firmicus Maternus, and Augustine (if we may reckon him here), all unite in their views in favour of the Apocalypse. Some of the eastern bishops, as we have seen, did not include it among the books to be publicly read.

To go further than this is needless, and indeed useless in this place. What is there then to set in opposition to this general, not to say universal, current of opinion, both early and late? First we have the opposition of the Alogi, in the second century, on ground confessedly of party feelings and subjective views. Then comes Caius of Rome, whose views have been so fully discussed, and whose opposition to the true Apocalypse remains still a matter somewhat in the dark; but if it was real, it was only on subjective grounds and not historical ones, inasmuch as he was involved in sharp dispute with the Montanists. Then, near the middle of the third century, we have Dionysius of Alexandria, who merely rejects the *apostolic* origin but not the divine authority of the book, and gives no *historical* reasons for his opinion, inasmuch as he argues merely from the style and diction of the book. We next come, in the fourth century, to Eusebius, whose mind vacillated in regard to the

question of genuineness, and appears to have remained undecided. But in the latter part of this century, and in the Greek church of Asia Minor and some other places, we find a few persons like Cyrill, with whom Amphilochus may be classed, who cautiously abstained from appealing to the Apocalypse; and several of the fathers, who did not include it in the Canon of books to be publicly read. The Council of Laodicea may perhaps be reckoned here; if indeed, (which is quite doubtful), the 60th Canon of the Council is genuine; (See p. 359 above, and Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1830, p. 591 seq.) After this period, we find only here and there a solitary voice raised against the Apocalypse, until, at length, the reception became universal, or all but universal. Modern times have waked up the spirit of controversy about it again, and the battle is not yet ended.

Now what is there in the nature and manner of this opposition in ancient times, which should lead us to reject the Apocalypse? It has, one may say, undivided and unquestioned sway, down to the time of Dionysius. There is nothing in all the opposition which would excite a serious doubt in the mind of any candid and critical investigator. Dionysius neither raises nor suggests any *historical* grounds of doubt. His other grounds remain to be further examined. Whatever doubt might arise, or did arise, another century later, was not originated, so far as we know, by any historical evidence; for such evidence there is not, and no appeal is made to it. What reason is there, then, that we should not give credit to traditionary testimony, so early, so uniform, so long continued?

Lücke, when he comes to sum up the whole, concedes, that the exegetical phenomena of the book and the tradition of the churches unite in favour of it. He suggests only, in abatement of this, that from the third century there was a division of opinion among the churches about the origin and authority of the Apocalypse. How much this amounts to, the reader has now had opportunity of seeing and examining.

But why does not Lücke admit, then, the apostolic origin of the book? Because, as he avers, there is no proof that the witnesses made thorough investigation of the matter or subjected it to real critical inquiry. "Their opinion," says he (p. 357), "is no *wahres Wissen* (true knowledge), but only a *blosses Meinen* (bare supposition)". As I have before remarked (p. 353 above), I cannot conceive on what basis such a statement rests. What I mean is, that the same requisition which he here makes, would leave every book in the New Testament destitute of valid support. None of the witnesses were there to see the actual writing of any book. Of course that had no *true knowledge*, in the sense which he seems to insist on. None of them have any testimony different in nature or kind from that of the Apocalypse. Besides; did not Irenaeus

receive testimony from the personal friends of John? Was Origen no critical investigator? Was Jerome no critic? Too late, indeed, for the highest purposes of historical criticism, did the latter live; but not the former. And even Irenaeus—does he not tell us, in regard to the wonderful number of the beast, i. e. 666, that he had compared copies—*ancient* and recent copies—in which he found this number; while 616 was only in the *more recent* Mss.? In the days of Irenaeus, then, the Apocalypse had been so long in circulation, that the Mss. were already classed as *ancient* and *modern*. The early credit of the book seems to be well established from this. And indeed, if the credit due to the Apocalypse is to be decided only on such grounds as Lücke here assumes, there is not a book of the New Testament that will stand before the like process and principles of decision. Surely the Gospel and Epistles of John must fall before them.

Lücke himself is candid enough to admit, that the arguments against the Apocalypse on historical grounds amount to nothing serious. He therefore feels obliged to resort to the *internal* evidences which make against it, and which he deems sufficient. With all the concessions, however, which he makes in respect to the weakness of the arguments from historical facts against the book, he still does not attribute any *decisive* weight to the external testimony in favour of it. But I do not perceive in what way my mind can be brought into this position. I would not say indeed, with Sir Isaac Newton, that "I do not find any other book of the New Testament which is so strongly established, or which was written upon so early," (Rem. on Rev.); but I may say, with Wetstein, that 'the Apocalypse from the primitive age was well known and received.' There are a number of books admitted into the New Testament Canon, in respect to which less positive and less general evidence can be produced in behalf of them, than in favour of the Apocalypse. Lücke himself admits some other writings of John on historical grounds less satisfactory.

Indeed, if the claim of the Apocalypse to be of apostolic origin and canonical, be not admitted, so far as traditionary history is concerned, one must abandon the admission of any New Testament book on this ground. Where is one that has not had its opposers and gainsayers and doubters, in ages that are past? If now all these are to be chronicled, and summed up, and brought in competition with the mighty overwhelming stream of testimony in the church catholic, in the Latin, Greek, and Syrian churches, where is the end of dispute and of doubt? And when are we ever to arrive at stable ground, and occupy it, in regard to such a matter? There is no end to skepticism of this sort, provided every breath of opposition is to kindle it into life.

It is only in the last half of the fourth century that we find anything

like an extensive state of doubting or hesitation in regard to the Apocalypse; and this was principally among some of the churches in the countries of Asia Minor. But of this doubt, we know not whether it pertained merely to the question of *apostolical* origin, like the doubt of Dionysius, or whether the inspiration itself of the book was called in question. The practice of withholding some books from public lection, or from common use—an ancient custom among the Jews as to Coheleth and Canticles—makes the omission of the Apocalypse in the lists of sacred books, at that time and in that quarter, a circumstance on which little or no dependence can be placed for evidence against the authenticity of the book.

One thing seems quite certain; which is, that if the alleged peculiarities of style and diction in the Apocalypse had not awakened doubts or suspicion, no one would have ever thought of attributing any deficiency to the historical evidence in favour of the book. And as the whole matter now stands, the appeal may be made with confidence to all intelligent and candid critics in these matters, whether the historical evidence in favour of its apostolic origin is not so far satisfactory as to be quite conclusive, unless the internal phenomena of the book are such as to render it impossible for impartial judges to acquiesce in the apparent decision of historical testimony.

§ 19. *General Remarks on the alleged indirect testimony against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse.*

According to the division of the subject made near the commencement of § 17, this category includes *the objections against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, which are drawn from its style, its sentiments, or its diction.* The peculiar structure of sentences or phrases, unusual regimen of words, apparent solecisms or barbarisms, a diction different from that of John in his Gospel and Epistle, a different use of particles, or of participles, or of the tenses of verbs, etc., and a different circle of ideas, as well as a discrepancy in doctrines—these, and other things connected with them, have been of late appealed to with an entire confidence, that the argument drawn from them *against* the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse is unanswerable. We have already seen what some of the leading German critics of the present day have said in respect to this matter, p. 284 seq. above. It is difficult to find more confident assertions and conclusions, in any part of the domain of criticism, than they have made in relation to the Apocalypse. The ground on which assertions so confident rest, ought at least to be very firm and solid; for nothing less than this can justify declarations of such a character.

A portion of the allegations against the Apocalypse to which I have

just adverted, and which pertain to the idiom of the book in various respects, I have already examined at sufficient length in § 15, inasmuch as these things stand connected with the aesthetical and linguistic character of the book. But it still remains, to notice many other particulars which could not there be appropriately considered.

In entering upon such a field, where there is so much that is arbitrary and subjective, so much that depends on taste, imagination, maturity or immaturity of judgment, nice discernment (or the reverse) as to points of similarity and dissimilarity, and on the views which different men may have of what is evidence of homogeneousness of authorship or of the contrary, it is impossible not to feel a degree of embarrassment and reluctance. And this is not a little increased, by looking back upon the history of internal criticism for some time past. The old Testament and the New have both experienced a large measure of arbitrary *critique*. A full history of criticism in respect to it, would be replete with warning and instruction to bold and confident adventurers. The Pentateuch, and specially the book of Deuteronomy, has been characterized in a manner directly opposite, by writers of high renown. So has it fared with the book of Job; specially with the speeches of Elihu, the prologue, and epilogue. Isaiah has come in for a full share of the like criticism. The most discrepant and directly opposite opinions have been formed and proclaimed respecting the last twenty-six chapters of this book, and various other portions of it, both as to the style and diction. So it is with the book of Zechariah, and some others. But not to insist on these, if we come to the New Testament, we shall find the same discrepancies. Matthew has been rejected by Schulz and others as an unworthy and incredible document. The Gospel of John has been rejected by Eckermann, J. E. C. Schmidt, Vogel, Horst, Bretschneider, and others. De Wette doubts whether Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles; as do some others. He also doubts the first epistle of Peter, and the epistle to the Ephesians. The 2 Thess. he thinks is interpolated; as does Schmidt also. Lange, Cludius, Bretschneider, and others, doubt whether the first epistle of John is genuine. Schleiermacher calls in question the first epistle to Timothy. Eichhorn and De Wette argue against the credit of all the *pastoral* epistles. And in almost all these cases, reliance is placed almost entirely on the *internal evidences* of discrepancy in style, i. e. on this as judged of by the respective writers. Bretschneider represents the factitious author of John's Gospel as concealing his (John's) name, that he might seem to be the more sincere to the reader and not appear to be fraudulent in his design (p. 112 Prob.); while (on p. 223) he speaks of there being men in the church who would detect and expose the fraud. Schleiermacher, on 1 Timothy, declares that "all the epistles of Paul exceed this in expression;" while Eichhorn,

on directly opposite ground, rejects the Pauline origin of the pastoral epistles, "because they are adorned with a perspicuity, a concinnity, and an elegance, which is wanting in the Pauline epistles."

These are but mere specimens of what might easily be produced, even to the satiety of the reader. In regard to the book before us, we need only to refer to such men as Semler, Oeder, Corrodi, and their followers, for specimens (I had almost said) of every kind of ignominy and reproach respecting it; while, on the other hand, such men as Bossuet, Herder, Eichhorn, and even Ewald and Lücke, unite, as we have seen, in extolling the aesthetical beauties and merits of the Apocalypse. And so the book has fared in regard to its alleged peculiar idioms and diction. One class of critics has magnified and even exaggerated everything of this sort, which can in any way be made plausible; while another has found no more departures from the Johannean style in the Gospel and Epistles than the different nature of the subjects treated of, and the kind of composition employed, would naturally demand. Where is the end of all this? What arbiter possesses authority to step in and decide between the parties? Doubtless there is none, who can authoritatively decide. Appeals to councils or popes, to archbishops or bishops, to clergymen or laymen, on the ground of *authority*, one can no longer expect will be heard, even if they should be made. It is too late. Nothing but the hard-earned fruits of study wrought into a convincing shape of critical argumentation, can now bring this dispute to a close. Even this, no one man, nor any one generation, can reasonably expect to achieve. The subjects of examination are many of them so tenuous and difficult, the judgment demanded in respect to them is so nice and discriminating, the knowledge requisite to judge must be so extensive and critical, that all which any man can expect now to do, is to make some contribution toward bringing the subject to a close. At some future period, I doubt not, the whole matter will be placed in such a position, that critical impartiality and fairness cannot refuse their assent. But such ground can be ultimately won, only by persevering efforts in the study and criticism of the Apocalypse.

Considerations of this nature may serve to dampen the ardour of some enthusiastic minds, who expect that they shall be able to make all men see as they themselves do. Feeling no doubts, and perceiving no good reason to doubt, they cannot understand how anything short of infidel skepticism can take the liberty to differ from them. I would not disturb this happy confidence—happy if in the right. But, for myself, I do not enter on that part of the discussion now before us, with any overweening expectations. For reasons already stated, we see how intelligent and inquiring men may differ. This difference in regard to the Apocalypse has, as my examination has led me to believe, been

greatly augmented by personal feelings, and doctrinal views, and the fashionable criticism of the day. Nor is this remark to be limited to any one party. Some of the advocates of the Apocalypse have, at times, employed but sorry reasoning in its defence. Moreover, it has often been assailed with a spirit, which, acting consistently with itself, would cover with midnight darkness the genuineness of every ancient book. Let us try, in our course, to impinge neither upon Scylla nor Charybdis. If all be not won, something perhaps may be gained; and every step that is fairly taken in advance, brings us somewhat nearer the desired goal.

Before proceeding to a particular examination of the internal phenomena of the Apocalypse, and comparing its style and diction with those of John's other books, it is proper to make some general remarks on the principles by which our judgment ought to be guided on this occasion. I do not expect to advance any positions which are new and strange, and thus to appeal to the credulity rather than to the understanding of the reader. But it is proper to place before him some landmarks by which I shall endeavour to steer my course, in order that he may see whether a safe and judicious course is taken to arrive at the end proposed.

§ 20. *Principles to be regarded in judging of the style and diction of the Apocalypse.*

(1) It is now agreed on all hands, among intelligent critics, that the Apocalypse, as has more than once been said, is essentially A BOOK OF PROPHETIC POETRY. Nearly all the prophecy of the Old Testament is Hebrew poetry; and even that which is not strictly so, retains much of the spirit, manner, and diction of poetry. The Hebrew has even a kind of poetic dialect; i. e. there are some words, forms of speech, forms of suffix pronouns, constructions after verbs, uses of the article, and other like things, which are appropriate and peculiar to the poetic dialect. Besides this, the whole circle of imagery, trope, symbol, impassioned language, breviloquence, ellipsis, and the like, is widely different in poetry from that of common prose. No experienced reader needs one word for proof of these propositions. They are as true also of the Greek, Latin, and English poetry, as they are of the Hebrew. Gray in his Pindaric Odes, in his Elegy on a Country Church-yard, and in his familiar Letters, is scarcely the same man. Of course the like is true, in a good degree, of Pope, or Dryden, or Thompson, or Akenside, or any other distinguished man. Some differ much more from themselves in prose, when they write poetry, than others do. No exact limits can be assigned to a thing of this nature. But it must be

true, that in the higher walks of poetry, the imaginative, the symbolic, the exhibition of *pictures* before the reader rather than *descriptions* of things, must always make a decided difference between this and prose, both in the circle of language and of thought. We should call a writer of poetry very unskilful and inept, should this fail to be the case.

If now the author of the Apocalypse be the same man who wrote the Gospel and Epistles, he had at least an entirely different task to perform in these two cases. The first is prediction, poetic description of the future by means of continual symbols, or prophetic visions in which all disclosure is made by symbol. The latter books are didactic discourses, dialogistic controversy, simple historical narrative, and simple practical exhortations to love and harmony and piety, with warnings against the spirit of error which was beginning to develope itself. The latter, too, were written when no fiery persecution was going on, no peril of life and liberty and property was instant. But the Apocalypse was written in the very furnace of affliction, heated beyond its usual intensity. Everything—the personal state of the writer, his relations, his solicitudes, his object in writing, were all of a different tenor from those in the Gospel and Epistles.

In a writer of any skill, power, and compass of mind, who possesses any good degree of versatility or choice of expression, there must of necessity be some striking discrepancies as to *manner*, on occasions so very different. It is not merely just to allow it, but in a man of such sympathies as John possessed, inclined to the doctrinal, the speculative, the affectionate, the highly sympathetic, we should of course expect that such differences must take place. Qualities such as these cannot be denied to the author of the Gospel and Epistles; and why may they not have developed themselves in the way in which they appear in the Apocalypse? It is only on the ground that John is supposed to have been incapable of forming but one mold for his productions, that the *power* of writing the Apocalypse can be denied him.

(2) It seems altogether probable, or indeed quite certain, from internal evidence, that the Apocalypse was written soon after John left Palestine and went to Ephesus. Lücke supposes a ten years' residence of John in Asia, before the Apocalypse was written, p. 364. But the notices which we have of him show, that he did not act as a missionary abroad, until near the time when Jerusalem was destroyed; see Danemann, Verfasser der Offenb. p. 3 seq. 1841. When the Apocalypse was written, in A. D. 68 or 69, he was then still fresh in the Hebrew idiom. He was deeply conversant with the Hebrew prophets. This must be true of the man who wrote the Apocalypse; and it is altogether probable that John was at all events a man of this cast. The models of the Apocalypse are all to be found in the Old Testament. Many

things in Daniel, Zechariah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and some others, reappear in some respects, but still cast into a new form, in this book. How could the idiom be otherwise than strongly Hebraistic? And if John had recently gone to Ephesus, the Greek which he as yet spoke or wrote, must be altogether of the Hebraistic cast. I say this, because I cannot bring myself to doubt, that he did speak this language in Palestine. It must be such of course, as he had learned and spoken in that country. Some ten or twelve years after this, when he wrote his Gospel and Epistles, what wonder that he should have attained to a style in many respects discrepant from that of the Apocalypse? And more especially so, since those productions were of a tenor so entirely different from that of the Apocalypse. John was doubtless an apt and ready learner; and a few years' residence among those who used Greek in all their oral communications and books, must have made a very sensible difference in his circle of Greek words and his facility of employing them. Specially must this be true of the *particles*, i. e. the prepositions and conjunctions, which, in the Greek, are the nicest and most difficult part of all the language, and the very last thing to which, in all their tenuous and distinctive relations, a foreigner ever attains. Accordingly, the most striking peculiarities of the Apocalypse have relation to these. It is but fair, in judging of the idioms of this book, that a matter like this should be fully taken into the account.

(3) More distinctly than has yet been done, should the *difference of subjects* treated of in the Apocalypse be brought into view. It is not merely the poetry of this book, with its concomitant tropes and symbols, and glances into the invisible world, and machinery of angels and devils and terrific monsters, and the like, which differs from the prose of the Gospel and Epistles, but the *subjects* themselves which are designed to be presented in the Apocalypse, the great contest between all that is good and all that is evil, the various efforts of the struggling parties alternately successful and unsuccessful for a season, the symbolico-historic picture as it were of this contest down to the time of the final and complete victory of the church, the grounds of encouragement and triumph to the bleeding martyrs in view of this—these and the like make such a wide discrepancy between the Apocalypse and the didactic and the hortative in the Gospel and Epistles of John, that one can hardly place these books side by side, with the expectation of finding anything more than general traits of similarity, where the nature of the case and the subjects treated of will permit.

(4) It is agreed on all hands, that the New Testament exhibits a Hebrew-Greek style throughout. From what has already been stated respecting John and the time when the Apocalypse was written, it is altogether to be expected that the Apocalypse will strongly develope this.

It is enough to show that the idioms of the Apocalypse are *Hellenistic*, to render it possible or probable that they may have been employed by John the apostle. How can we demand that such a writer should run all his expressions, in respect to matters so discrepant, in one and the same mold? It is enough, then, to show of any word, or expression, or construction in syntax, that it is of the Hebrew-Greek; or, at all events, to show that it is not an unusual one in this idiom. I do not indeed mean to aver, that there might not be some modes of expression, even in this, so foreign to the idiom of John in his Gospel, as to afford satisfactory proof of authorship not apostolic in respect to the Apocalypse. But what I would say is, that cases of this nature must be *clearly marked*, and placed in a strong light so as to be prominent and striking, before we can decide by virtue of them against the current testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity.

§ 21. *Particular examination of objections drawn from the style, diction, etc., of the Apocalypse.*

I. Words and phrases in John, but not in the Apocalypse.

Before I proceed to notice these in detail, it is proper to remark, that Ewald, Lücke, Schott, Bretschneider, and Credner,* are the writers whom I have in view; and among these, Lücke is the principal one, because his work, if not the most recent of all, is the most extensive and able. Most of the objections and difficulties to be canvassed are common to all these writers, and are crowded by them into a small compass. I do not deem it worth the trouble to assign the specific passage and author from which each and every objection advanced is taken. Most of them are the same in all the writers named; and all of them may be easily and readily found by any reader who wishes to find them. I merely reserve the right of occasionally designating something that is peculiar or specially important, by referring it distinctly to the source from which it comes.

(1) 'The Gospel and Epistle of John not unfrequently employ the genuine Greek particles *πάντοτε, πώποτε, οὐδέποτε, οὐδέπω*, while they are wholly omitted in the Apocalypse.'

This statement is far from being precise in some of its aspects. E. g. (*a*) *πάντοτε* is not frequent in any New Testament writer but Paul. Matthew and Mark exhibit it only twice respectively, and both in the same sentence as spoken by Christ, Matt. 26: 11. Mark 14: 7. Luke

* Ewald, Comm. in Apoc. § 9. Lücke, Einleit. etc. § 38 seq. Schott, Isagoge, § 116. Bretschneider, Probabilia, etc. § 28 seq. Credner, Einleit. in das N. Test. § 266.

but twice in his Gospel, and not at all in the Acts. John employs it seven times in his Gospel, but not once in his Epistle.* The probable reason why it was not used in the Apocalypse, seems to be, that it was not needed. The same is true of the Acts, and 1st John; which are not spurious because *πάντοτε* is wanting. (*b*) *πώποτε* is rare even in the classics, except after a negative particle. It is almost an entire stranger to the New Testament. Luke employs it once; John, four times in his Gospel, and once in his Epistle. This is all; and of course nothing can be made of this. (*c*) *Οὐδέποτε* is employed by John in his Gospel and Epistle but once (Gosp. 7: 46), and plainly is far enough from being a favourite particle in the New Testament Greek. Paul uses it once, or if we include the Epistle to the Hebrews, only three times. The classical writers employ it principally for the *never* of the *past*. The Apocalyptist has no occasion for this; and the *never* of the *future* he makes by the *οὐκ ἔτι* so common in the New Testament Greek, because it corresponds well with the Hebrew לֹא עוֹד. See in Apoc. 10: 6. 18: 14—23. 21: 1—4 al., and in Gosp. 14: 30. 16: 10, 21, 25. 17: 11. 21: 6 al. Yet the Epistle of John does not exhibit it. Nothing can be argued for or against the genuineness of a book, in reference to *οὐδέποτε* thus conditioned. (*d*) *οὐδέπω* is almost a total stranger to the New Testament; John's Gospel thrice, Paul once, Luke once. This is the *never* of the *past*, and the Apocalyptist has no occasion for it.

(2) '*Καθώς* is frequent in the Gospel and Epistle, but not employed at all in the Apocalypse.'—This is true, and somewhat striking. Yet among the most Hebraizing writers, I observe that *καθώς* is quite unfrequent; e. g. Matt. three times, Mark seven; even Luke makes but a moderate use of it, specially in the Acts. The particle *ὡς*, (differing little if any from *καθώς* in most cases), corresponds more nearly and simply with the Hebrew כַּאֲשֶׁר, כְּ; and so it is used, times almost without number, in every part of the New Testament, and everywhere in the Apocalypse, where the sense of *as, in like manner as*, etc., is required. The later use of *καθώς* by John, in his Gospel and Epistle, shows a habit, when he wrote these, of employing the rounder and fuller expression instead of the simple *ὡς*; which one may easily suppose to have been acquired by longer usage in Greek. The difference in usage I have acknowledged to be striking, and one naturally adapted to excite inquiry or doubt; but it is not characteristic enough, nor important

* The reader is desired to take notice, that in the inquiry about style and diction, most writers have of late omitted to take into view the 2d and 3d of John; and so I shall do here, for they are so brief, that they cannot affect the main result. The first Epistle was, in ancient times, almost universally acknowledged as John's; and so we may the more readily refer to it in this discussion about the genuineness of another Johannean writing.

enough, to decide the great question before us, or even to afford much aid for this purpose. *Καθὼς γέγραπται* is used some thirteen times in Paul's Epistle to the Romans; and only some three or four times elsewhere in all his writings. *Καθὼς* is not in 2 Tim., Tit., Philem., James, Jude. In 1 Tim. and 1 Pet. only once each; in 2 Thess. twice. It is impossible to put dependence on a matter like this, when *ὡς* and *καθὼς* may be in most cases indifferently employed; in others, the latter is more appropriate in ratiocination, and so might the more easily be chosen in the Gospel of John.

(3) '*Ὡς* in the sense of *when* is frequent in the Gospel, but not in the Apocalypse.'—The fact must be admitted. Yet it is less striking and conclusive, than it at first appears to be. John employs it not in the sense of *when* in his Epistle. Paul uses it in this sense in some Epistles, but not at all in others. Matthew and Mark, the Hebraizing evangelists, never employ *ὡς* in the sense of *when*. In the Apocalypse, there is scarcely occasion to express this idea; and when there is, there are so many ways of doing it, by participles with such an adsignification, and other various modes of expression, that nothing special can be made out of it. It seems quite probable, as in the case of Matthew and Mark, that the Hebraistic style did not early and easily adopt this secondary sense of *ὡς*.

(4) '*Μέν* and *μέντοι* are wanting in the Apocalypse. John employs them both.'—Yet Lücke is candid enough to say (p. 365), that 'these particles are in their nature so *syntactical*, that in a composition like the Apocalypse they might be wanting, even if John was the author.' This is the more credible, in fact, since John, in all his Gospel, has *μέν* but thrice, and not at all in his Epistle. As to *μέντοι*, it is found five times in John's Gospel, but not in his Epistle, nor but thrice more in all the New Testament. However common *μέν* may be elsewhere, to John it is a kind of stranger; and *μέντοι* is so to the New Testament Greek in general.

(5) 'The *conjunctive* and *transitive* particles *δέ*, *οὖν*, *τε*, *γάρ*, are very unfrequent in the Apocalypse, although common in John.'—For the full discussion of this matter, and the peculiar use of *καί* in the room of some of them, the reader is referred back to § 15, p. 250 seq. All of them excepting *τε* appear in the Apocalypse, so that the writer was not a stranger to them. But the use of *καί*, in a manner like that of the Proteus ו of the Hebrews (as it has been called), in the strongly Hebraizing style of the Apocalypse, has rendered the use of the other conjunctives and transitives unfrequent; see ib.

(6) 'The Gospel and Epistle are rich in antithetic parallels, generally united by *ἀλλά*; but the Apocalypse has them not, at least in this form.'—And why? Plainly because it is not ratiocinative and didactic,

like those books. Yet *ἀλλά* is no stranger in the Apocalypse; see 2: 4, 6, 9, 14, 20. 3: 9. 9: 5. 10: 7, 9. 17: 12. 20: 6. In the epistles to the churches, which approach nearer the other works of John in their tenor, we have in proportion as frequent use of *ἀλλά* as in John elsewhere. And as to the kind of antithesis to which Lücke refers as being wanting, see in 2: 9. 3: 9. 9: 5. 10: 7. 20: 6—a full proportion of cases. Besides, *ἀλλά* is not very frequent in the Epistle of John. Nothing important can be made of this.

(7) 'In John, *θεάομαι* and *θεωρέω* are favourite words of John, for *seeing*, while the Apocalypse employs *ὁράω* and *βλέπω*.'—A part of this statement is quite aside from the fact. John employs *ὁράω*, (mostly in the Perf.) some twenty-seven times; the Apocalypse only three. Again John employs *βλέπω* sixteen times, and the Apocalypse the same number. These two verbs, then, are common ground altogether. As to *θεάομαι*, John uses it only ten times in the Gospel and Epistle, in all which cases it implies a *continued inspection* and *contemplation*. It is not in the Apocalypse. And as to *θεωρέω*, it is somewhat frequent in the Gospel, but occurs only once in the Epistle. It occurs, moreover, in Apoc. 11: 11, 12. The only one of these verbs then about which anything can be said to our present purpose is *θεάομαι*. In the Apocalypse the writer had his choice between this verb and *βλέπω*. The latter means to direct one's vision toward anything, and is more appropriate, in the designation of such rapidly passing visions, than *θεάομαι* would be, employed as John elsewhere employs it. As to the favourite *ἑώρακα* of John, in his Gospel, the use of the *Perfect* tense, which carries along with it the idea of an abiding action, would be inappropriate to the apocalyptic visions. The common Preterite of the Apocalyptist is *εἶδον*, when he describes the *perception* of a vision or spectacle that had passed before his view,—an appropriate word. And in his Gospel, John employs the same word in the like sense immeasurably oftener than any other verb, or than all other verbs, of *seeing*. Amid such a variety as the Greek language furnishes, why should it be deemed strange, that *θεάομαι* is omitted in the Apocalypse? Lücke remarks, as a peculiarity of the Apocalypse, that *εἶδον* (4: 1) is used without an object after it. But is there not the same usage in Gosp. 1: 40? Besides in 4: 1, it is plainly = וְהִנֵּה רָאִיתִי, which is so common a phrase of transition in Hebrew. It is unnecessary to say more.

(8) '*Ἐργάζεσθαι* in Rev. 18: 17 has an entirely different sense from that in John.'—But this is not a well grounded objection. This verb may be used, and is used, either absolutely or with an Accusative. In the Gospel 6: 27, 28. 9: 4, (and frequently elsewhere), the Accusative stands after it, as in Rev. 18: 17. And as to the meaning here—is it not familiar and good Greek usage to say, *ἐργάζεσθαι γῆν—θάλασσαν*,

and the like? And what is there singular in it, that John should employ so familiar an expression?

(9) The objection from *ῥήματα*, in Rev. 17: 17, viz. that John no where employs the *plural* of this word, is rendered nugatory by the removal of the reading; which now is *οἱ λόγοι*.

(10) '*Φωνέω* is used in the Gospel more than twelve times; only once in the Apocalypse;' Lücke p. 367.—*Ans.* Just twelve times in the Gospel; and in nearly every case it means to *call by name* in order to summon one's attention. In the Gospel, John has frequent occasion for this meaning; in the Apocalypse he has not. In 14: 18 it occurs in its original sense, *to make a sound;* in the like sense, Gosp. 13: 38. 18: 27. It is not to be found in the Epistle.

(11) '*Μένει* is frequent in John, and but once (17: 10) in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* This is true; but it is enough to say, that John has not occasion for the verb in the Apocalypse, and therefore does not employ it. In the Gospel and Epistle it is employed in nearly all cases to designate the abiding influence of the Spirit in Christians, or the perseverance of Christians in love and faith. The *different* sense which Lücke assigns to *μεῖναι* in Apoc. 17: 10, I do not perceive. Is not the sense of *abiding*, or *continuing*, common to John's Gospel and Epistle, and is not the same the sense of *μεῖναι* in Rev. 17: 10?

(12) '*Ἐν εἶναι* and *εἶναι ἔν τινι* are frequent in John; but not in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* This is true of the latter expression; the former occurs but a few times. These are formulas of expression which are employed in the discussion of spiritual unity—the unity of God and Christ, the union of Christ and his disciples, or of the disciples with each other. The *ἔν τινι* may be well compared with the *ἐν κυρίῳ* so common in Paul. The tenor of the Apocalypse does not lead to the employment of such abstract expressions. Still, comp. *ἐν πνεύματι* in Rev. 4: 2. 21: 10, and *ἐν κυρίῳ* 14: 13. This last is of the same nature as those above.

(13) '*Ἀληθῶς* and *παῤῥησία* are common in John; but not in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* *ἀληθῶς* appears but once in the Epistle, and not at all in the Apocalypse. In the Gospel eleven times. It is a word of asseveration in grave reasoning and declarations, and can be expected only in oratorical and didactic discourse. As to *παῤῥησία*, I do not see where, in the Apocalypse, there was any place for it, in the sense which John attaches to it; or if there is, why should a writer be limited to the choice of only one mode of expression?

(14) Schott alleges that '*ὑψοῦσθαι* and *δοξάζεσθαι*, applied to Christ *glorified*, are wanting in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* The former verb is used by John only in his Gospel; and there it is applied only to Christ elevated on the cross; and even this phraseology seems to

have come from a comparison with the *lifting up* of the serpent in the wilderness; see 3: 14. 8: 28. 12: 32, 34. The Apocalypse has no occasion for this. As to *δοξάζεσθαι* in John's Gospel, in all that is peculiar it is applied to the future glorification of Christ, and is employed principally by Christ himself in reference to that event as a confirmation and consummation of his Messiahship. The Apocalypse everywhere exhibits Jesus in the attitude of having already attained this station, and as acting in it. The state itself, in comparison with his humiliation, is not the subject of discussion, but only of occasional reference, as Rev. 1: 18. *Δοξάζω* is no stranger to the Apocalypse, in its usual sense; 15: 4. 18: 7. But both the verbs in question are wanting in the Epistle of John. Is that any argument against its genuineness?

(15) 'Such words as *ζωὴ ἀώνιος, φῶς, σκοτία, ἀλήθεια, ὁδός, θύρα*, applied to Christian doctrine and to Christ himself, do not occur in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* This is true for the most part; but the ready answer is, that no discussions of such a kind as would call for these terms, employed in this way, occur in the Apocalypse. For *αἰώνιον* the writer employs the stronger *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*; but *εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον* occurs in 14: 6. The Epistle of John has no *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, although it is very frequent in his Gospel. The use of *ὁδός*, as applied to Christ in the Gospel, is purely accidental and occasional, and happens but once, 14: 4—6. To the figurative and Hebraistic sense of the word, the Apocalypse is no stranger, 15: 3. So of *θύρα*, as applied to Christ figuratively; there is merely one passage, viz. Gosp. 10: 1—7. It occurs not in the Epistle. Nothing can be made out of these words, thus occasionally employed, and merely so.

(16) '*Ἀπόλλυμι* is frequent in John; but not in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* The Apocalypse has another mode, a more poetical one, of designating future misery, viz. the lake of fire and brimstone. And John himself does not seem to have had any partiality for the word in question, as it does not occur in his Epistle. In the Gospel it belongs to the Saviour's discourses, and was somewhat often employed by him.

(17) 'The apocalyptic names of the evil spirit are *ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ διάβολος*, or *ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας*, and the like; while the Gospel has *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ πονηρός*, etc.'—*Ans. Διάβολος* is in the Apocalypse five times, in the Gospel and Epistle seven. *Σατανᾶς* is in the Gosp. 13: 27: in the Apocalypse oftener because of the Hebrew idiom. As to *πονηρός* for Satan, it is not once used in the Gospel; and it might well be omitted in the Apocalypse, which, from the nature of the book, has so many figurative names for Satan. As to *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου*, it occurs three times in the last address of Jesus to his disciples, and belongs only to him; neither the Epistle nor the Apocalypse has it. *Ὁ δράκων* is plainly a poetic Hebraistic appellation.

(18) '*Κόσμος* in the sense of *wicked men*, so common in John, and sometimes with other nouns combined, such as *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, σωτὴρ τοῦ κοσμου*, etc., does not appear in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* As to *ἄρχων*, etc., see above; *σωτὴρ τοῦ κοσμου* occurs only in the Gosp. 4: 42, and then it is the language of the Samaritan woman. In respect to *κόσμος, the world of men*, specially *the world of wicked* or *sinful men*, the Apocalypse does not employ it. *Γῆ* is the word for proper world, and occasionally *οἰκουμένη*. But the designations of the wicked are selected in such a way as best to accord with the nature of the scenic representations of the book, viz. such as *τὰ ἔθνη, οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θηρίον*, and the like, with *ἄπιστοι, πόρνοι, εἰδωλολάτραι*, etc.; all in better harmony with the vivid representations here. The *κόσμος* of John is not peculiar to him alone. Paul employs the word in the like sense. But still, it is a peculiar favourite of the Gospel and Epistle of John.

(19) 'Such expressions as *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁ παράκλητος, ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ψεύστης, ὁ πλάνος*, are foreign to the Apocalypse, and familiar to John.'—*Ans.* As to the first, no passage occurs in the Apocalypse apposite to the introduction of it. *Ὁ παράκλητος*, in its peculiar sense, is found only in the Gospel; for in the Epistle 2: 1 it has a different meaning. *Ὁ ἀντίχριστος* is found only in the Epistle; and *ὁ πλάνος* neither in the Gospel, Epistle, or Apocalypse, but only 2 John v. 7. *Ψεῦδος* is common to the Epistle and Apocalypse; *ψευδεῖς* occurs twice in the Apocalypse in the like sense with *ψεύστης*. Why should the same *form* of a word be always adopted by a writer?

(20) '*Ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, γεννηθῆναι ἐκ θεοῦ, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, and *πιστεύειν*, are common to John, and wanting in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* In nearly every case in which *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον* is found in the Gospel or Epistle, it relates to Christ's first advent and incarnation; a subject not treated of in the Apocalypse. As to *γεννηθῆναι ἐκ θεοῦ*, it occurs but once in the Gospel; and it belongs to a subject not treated of in the Apocalypse. *Τέκνα θεοῦ* occurs only twice in the Gospel, in connection with the preceding phraseology. In a like manner is *τέκνα* employed in the Apoc. 2: 23, i. e. in a figurative or tropical sense. As to *ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, it occurs but once in the Gospel and once in the Epistle. But *πιστεύειν* is everywhere to be found in the Gospel and Epistle, but not in the Apocalypse. The obvious reason is, that the Gospel was written in order to persuade men to *believe*; and the Epistle to guard them against deceivers and to confirm their belief. The Apocalypse treats of Christians amidst the fires of persecution; and instead of a simple discussion of *faith* or *belief*, it uses, in reference to continued fidelity, the tropical language of *conquering, abiding steadfast, following the Lamb, coming out of tribulation*,

cleansing the garments of saints in the blood of the Lamb. A variety of other poetical diction, also, adapted to the tenor of the book, is employed throughout.

(21) 'John uses *ἴδε*, but the Apocalypse *ἰδού*.'—*Ans.* The latter occurs five times in the Gospel. Both *ἴδε* and *ἰδού* are common to Hellenistic Greek; while *ἰδού* = הִנֵּה, has immeasurably the preference in usage. It is more Hebraistic; which of course agrees with the genius of the Apocalypse. Moreover, *ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε* is in the Apoc. 6: 1, 3, 5, 7, (just as in Gosp. 1: 40, 47), according to the text of Griesbach and Scholz. If admitted, it makes out a striking parallel.

(22) '*Πάλιν* and *ταράσσειν* are common to the Gospel and Epistle, but not to the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* *Πάλιν* is no stranger to the Apocalypse; see 10: 8, 11. It is not employed oftener because it is not needed. As to *ταράσσω*, it is not found in the Epistle, nor in the Apocalypse; and plainly because it is not needed. The Apocalypse employs more vivid language to describe agitations, griefs, and torments, such as *βασανίζω*, *κατακαύομαι*, *ἐρεμόω*, *διαφθείρω*, *ἀποκτείνω*, and the like.

(23) 'Phrases such as *εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* — *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου* — *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*, belong to John, and not to the Apocalypse.' Bretsch.—*Ans.* If the writer means that *ἐκ* is not employed in the Apocalypse to designate the relation of *belonging* or *appertaining to*, *associated with*, and the like, he is greatly mistaken; see in Rev. 5: 5, 9. 7: 4—9 (fourteen times). 11: 9. 17: 1, 11. 22: 21 al. Such a use is familiar even. But if Bretschneider means that these particular *formulae* or combinations of words are not employed in the Apocalypse, that may be conceded without any advantage to the cause which he advocates. Why should a writer always repeat the same forms of words and ideas, specially when his subjects are exceedingly diverse? And when Bretschneider adds to this list the phrase *εἶναι σὺν Χριστῷ* as peculiar to John, and wanting in the Apocalypse, I know not where to find it. John uses *σύν* but twice in the Gospel and Epistle; and then, not as here stated.

(24) 'In the Apocalypse we have *μαρτυρεῖν* with the Accusative after it; in John, it is followed by *περί τινος* and sometimes *τινι*;' Bretsch. —*Ans.* In the Gospel and Epistle we have the construction with the Accusative after this verb; e. g. Gosp. 3: 32. 5: 32. 19: 35. Epis. 1: 2. 5: 10. For the rest, the Apocalypse employs the verb but three times, and then only with a direct object, which of course is the Accusative. The Dative after *μαρτυρέω* is very rare, e. g. 5: 33. 18: 37, and then is a *Dativus commodi*.

(25) 'When *μαρτυρία* has a Genitive after it, such as *θεοῦ*, *χριστοῦ*, etc., it is always a Genitive *auctoris* in the Gospel and Epistle; in the Apocalypse, the Genitive designates the *object* of testimony.' So Bret-

schneider, who refers for proof to Apoc. 6: 9. 12: 11, 17. 19: 10, and 1: 9.—But in 6: 9 there is no such formula. In 12: 11, *αὐτῶν* is Genitive of *agent* or *author* instead of object. So in 12: 17 in respect to *Ἰησοῦ*; comp. *θεοῦ* in the preceding clause. In 19: 10 the same is the case; and in 1: 9 it is also the same, comp. *θεοῦ* in the preceding clause. Surely this objection does not well accord with *Probabilia*, the title of Bretschneider's book.

(26) '*Ἐκεῖνος* is very common in John; but it is scarcely employed in the Apocalypse.' Ewald, p. 67.—*Ans.* This is so; but this is easily accounted for. The Hebrew הוּא = *αὐτός* and *οὗτος*, but not *ἐκεῖνος*. Hence the Septuagint have not employed the latter more than three or four times. So with the Hebraizing style of the Apocalypse. Yet in Rev. 9: 6. 11: 13. 16: 14, *ἐκεῖνος* is employed; showing that the writer was no stranger to the word.

(27) 'The Gospel uses *Ἱεροσόλυμα*; the Apocalypse *Ἱερουσαλήμ*.' Ewald.—*Ans.* Both forms are common to the New Testament; e. g. Luke employs both interchangeably and very often. The form in the Apocalypse is more Hebraistic, and occurs only three times.

(28) '*Ἀκούω* with the Genitive after it is usual in the Gospel, but not to be found in the Apocalypse.' Ewald, p. 70.—*Ans.* This is a great mistake; see Genitive after *ἀκούω* in Apoc. 6: 1, 3, 5. 14: 13. 16: 1, 5, 7. 21: 3. On the other hand, the *Accusative* after this verb is no stranger to John; e. g. Gosp. 3: 8. 5: 24. 7: 40. 8: 26, 40, 43, 47. 14: 24 al. Both books in common admit both constructions, and nearly in a like proportion.

(29) '*Composite* verbs are much more frequent in John, than in the Apocalypse;' Ewald, p. 67.—*Ans.* I have been through the whole Greek Concordance, in order to see whether this is correct, and find it to be so far from being so, that even the contrary position, viz. that the Apocalypse makes the more frequent use of them, is nearer the truth. E. g. (1) Verbs common to both; *ἀποστέλλω*, *ἀναγινώσκω*, *ἐκκεντέω*, *ἐπιστρέφω*, *ἐκπορεύω*, *περιπατέω*, *ἀποκτείνω*, *συντρίβω*, *περιβάλλω*, *προσκυνέω*, *ἐξέρχομαι*, *καταβαίνω*, *συμβουλεύω*, *εἰσέρχομαι*, *ἀναβαίνω*, *κάθημαι*, *ἀπέρχομαι*, *καταφάγω*, *ἐκβάλλω*, *ἀφίημι*, *κατηγορέω*, *συνάγω*, *ἀποθνήσκω*, *ὑπάγω*, *ἐκχέω*, *ἐπιτίθημι*. In many of these cases, some of these verbs are very frequent respectively in one book, and not in the other; and this about in equal proportion. If there be any difference, it seems rather to be in favour of greater frequency in the Apocalypse. But (2) The Apocalypse has a large class of such words, not found in the Gospel or Epistle; e. g. *ἐνδύω*, *περιζώννυμι*, *κατοικέω*, *μετανοέω*, *ἐξαλείφω*, *ἐγχρίω*, *κατασφραγίζω*, *ἐκδικέω*, *ἀναπαύω*, *ἀποχωρίζομαι*, *κατακαίω*, *διαφθείρω*, *ἐπιθυμέω*, *ἐνδύω*, *περιζώννυμι*, *ἀποφέρω*, *συγκοινωνέω*, *ἀποδίδωμι*, *ἐπιγράφω*, *ἐπιτίθημι*. (3) On the other hand, in the Gospel

and Epistle, are *ἀναγγέλλω, παραλαμβάνω, συνέρχομαι, ἐπιβάλλω, καταλαμβάνω, ἐξηγήομαι, ἀποκρίνομαι, ἀπαγγέλλω, κατέχω, μεταβαίνω, ἀναπίπτω, ἀνίστημι.* On the whole, the *composite* verbs are more predominant in the Apocalypse; and specially so if it be compared with the Epistle. So much for assertions made at hazard, and without investigation.

(30) 'John frequently employs the simple *εἰ*, which is never used in the Apocalypse;' Credner, p. 730.—*Ans.* The simple *εἰ* in conditional propositions is indeed wanting in the Apocalypse; but so are the simple conditional propositions. Such an *εἰ* belongs to didactic argumentation. But *εἰ δὲ μή* may be found in 2: 5, 16; *εἰ μή* in six places; *εἴ τις* in seven more; and *ἐὰν μή* = *εἰ ἂν μή*, and *ἐάν* = *εἰ ἄν*, in eight more.

Such is the list of words and phrases found, as is alleged, in John but not in the Apocalypse. That some of the instances of discrepancy alleged are striking, I no not feel disposed to deny. If they were found in writings attributed to the same author, when writing on the same or on nearly related subjects, they would certainly throw serious difficulties in the way of maintaining sameness of authorship. As it is, while I feel the full force of the allegations made respecting them, I cannot think a conclusion can be safely drawn from them against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. We shall see, in the sequel, that there is no considerable epistle of Paul, which by a like process may not be wrested from him; e. g. the first Epistle to the Corinthians. We shall also see, that while there are so many discrepances of diction and phraseology between John's Gospel and Epistle and the Apocalypse, and even more which are to be added in the following section, yet there are also points of *resemblance* so numerous, that we could scarcely expect more, considering the peculiar nature of the book before us.

II. Words, phrases, etc., in the Apocalypse, but not in John.

(31) 'John employs no such titles as *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλεῶν τῆς γῆς*, in respect to Christ. These are peculiar to the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* The two first of these occur but once. Should we argue that the epistle to the Colossians is not Paul's, because in it he calls Christ *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (1: 15), which he nowhere else employs? As to *ἄρχων*, etc., the very phraseology is Johannean. Does not John employ *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου* several times to designate Satan, the prince of evil? And might he not use *ἄρχων* in the Apocalypse, in a different connection, to denote the supreme ruler over all?

(32) '*Οἰκουμένη* is used only in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* True; and it is scarcely to be found in the New Testament, excepting in Luke's

writings. But the very fact of its unfrequency, while it is still quite easily accounted for, makes it not at all inapposite for the Apocalypse. Why should peculiar diction be denied to such a book? Yet even here, it is found but three times. Paul employs it in his Epistle to the Romans; but not elsewhere. Can any critical argument be built upon this, against his other epistles?

(33) '*Ἔχειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ὑπομονή, λόγος τῆς ὑπομονῆς*, belong only to the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* The first of these expressions is used in Rev. 6: 9. 12: 17. 19: 10, respecting the martyrs who *held fast* the truth of the Gospel. And this and the other expressions are all peculiarly appropriate to the subject matter of the Apocalypse, and therefore are of course employed. The last expression occurs but once.

(34) '*Κρατεῖν τὴν διδαχήν—τὸ ὄνομα*, are not found in John.'—*Ans.* Nor in the Apocalypse, save in one passage, 2: 13—15; which are the words of Christ. But *διδαχὴ θεοῦ—χριστοῦ*, is common in John. The phraseology savours of his usage.

(35) 'The Apocalypse exhibits *ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, and *ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*; which John has not.'—*Ans.* These are mere transcripts of the Hebrew appellations יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת, אֵל שַׁדַּי. They are altogether in place, in the Apocalypse. And when Lücke here remarks, that *θεὸς καὶ πατήρ* (1: 6) is like Paul's usage, and not like John's which omits the *καί*, he appeals only to 2 John v. 3 for proof of the latter. How can anything be made of this? Paul himself in Gal. 1: 1 *omits καί* in this connection, and in 1: 3 *inserts* it. And when Bretschneider alleges, that the *Alpha* and *Omega* of the Apocalypse is nowhere else found, it is enough to say, that this is purely Hebraistic, and is merely a figurative manner of expressing רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֲרוֹן. Are the designations of the Godhead in 1 Tim. 1: 17 found anywhere else in Paul, or indeed in the New Testament?

(36) '*Ἀληθινός* in the Apocalypse means *faithful;* in John it means only *true, genuine*, in opposition to false or pretended.'—*Ans.* But what else except *faithful, veracious*, can *ἀληθινός* in Gosp. 7: 28 mean; and specially in 19: 35, which is clear? In the Apocalypse the word answers to the Hebrew נֶאֱמָן; and as God is so often appealed to as keeping his promises, *faithful* or *veracious* is a peculiarly appropriate meaning. Besides, the very application of the word to God is *Johannean* exclusively, and the argument lies in favour of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, rather than against it, by reason of this adjective so employed.

(37) '*Ἰσχυρός* is common in the Apocalypse, but not in John.'—*Ans.* It is found in 1 John 2: 14. Elsewhere John has no occasion to characterize *personal might.* In the Apocalypse it is applied to God, and to angels, for such a purpose; like the Hebrew אַבִּיר, *validus.*

(38) 'The Evangelist loves the *historic* Present; to the Apocalypse this is foreign;' Lücke p. 366.—*Ans.* There is no good foundation for this criticism. I have looked the Gospel and Apocalypse both carefully through, in order to see whether this is correct. I find one hundred cases of *historic* Present in the Gospel and forty in the Apocalypse. Of the one hundred, at least some sixty-five belong merely to the word λέγει constantly occuring in dialogistic representation, and scarcely employed in such representation in a *praeterite* way; and most of the other remaining thirty-five cases belong to ἔρχεται, or some like verb of motion. Making due allowance for this, there is no difference worthy of notice between the two books, in regard to this matter. Besides, the Epistle has scarcely a specimen of this idiom; and for an obvious reason. See the remarks in § 15 p. 239 seq. above; where the subject is more fully discussed.

(39) 'The Gospel often begins sentences without a copula, either by the historic Present or the Praeterite; the Apocalypse has not a trace of such a usage;' Lücke ut sup.—*Ans.* The usage in question is indeed very common in the Gospel and Epistle. Yet if the reader will open the Apocalypse, and read the first three chapters whose subject-matter approaches nearer than the rest of the book to the writings just named, he will find the *asyndic* construction of sentences as frequent as in John. It may be found elsewhere also; e. g. Apoc. 11: 4, 6. 17: 8, 10, 13, 14 al. In respect to the *visions* of the book, the use of καί is very striking as to conformity with the Hebrew. But on this subject I have already remarked; see § 15 p. 250 seq. above.

(40) 'In the Apocalypse the peculiar idiom of οὗτος . . . ἵνα does not occur, which is so frequent in the Gospel and Epistle.' Lücke, p. 366.—*Ans.* Including αὕτη, οὗτοι, τοῦτο, ταῦτα, with ἵνα after them, one finds some twenty cases in the Gospel and Epistle. In Rev. 11: 6, we find the same idiom. But the nature of the representations in the Apocalypse, which are rapid and brief, does not require, nor even bear, the exegetical and in some measure repetitious structure of οὗτος . . . ἵνα, and the like. The difference in this respect is certainly notable; but the nature of the composition seems not only to admit, but rather to demand, such a difference.

(41) 'In the Gospel, *attraction* of the relative pronoun is very frequent; in the Apocalypse it is nowhere found;' Lücke, p. 365.—The answer is, that in the Gospel I have, with a search extending through the whole, found attraction only in 2: 22. 4: 50. 7: 31, 39. 15: 20. 17: 5. 21: 10. In the Epistle only twice. On the other hand, the Apoc. 1: 20 presents us with ὧν εἶδες, a clear case, (only Lachmann preferring οὓς); and in 18: 6, ᾧ ἐκέρασε is a case about which no doubt exists. Neither part of Lücke's position seems then to be correct. Besides, as

this usage is one of *special* idiom, we could hardly expect its frequency in the Apocalypse. The *Hebraizing* Matthew and Mark never exhibit attraction, one only case in Mark 7: 13 excepted.

(42) ' The Genitive absolute is wanting in the Apocalypse, but is frequent in John ;' Lücke ut sup.—*Ans.* In the Gospel I find some fifteen cases of this Genitive ; but in the Epistle none at all. On the other hand, *βλεπόντων* in Rev. 17: 8 I take to be in the Genitive absolute. The want of this structure in the Epistle is no sound argument against its genuineness. Such constructions, and specially the frequency of them, depend very much on the nature of the composition.

(43) ' No *ἐν τούτῳ . . . ὅτι* in the Apocalypse, while it is very frequent in John ;' ib. p. 366.—*Ans.* I find but four cases of this in the Gospel, while in the Epistle there are ten. The formula is employed in cases where peculiar specification or exemplification, in order to be very explicit, is aimed at ; and nearly always in grave reasoning or argumentation. Hence the Epistle has so much of it ; while the Apocalypse, a very different book, has none. The composition of the latter is indeed quite of a diverse tenor, in many respects, from that of the Epistle.

(44) ' The Apocalypse has no *ὅτι* before direct quotation, while this is frequent in John.' ib. p. 366.—*Ans.* As to *direct* or formal quotation from Scripture, the Apocalypse never makes it ; see p. 231 above. In respect to reciting the *words* of any person, the usage is variable in the Gospel. Frequently *ὅτι* is inserted before the words directly quoted ; e. g. 1: 20, 32. 4: 42. 6: 14 al. saepe. But not unfrequently *ὅτι* is omitted, e. g. in 1: 15, 21, 22, 23. 6: 65. 7: 12, 28, 37, 40, 41. 19: 12, 24, 28, 37. 20: 21, 22. Some of these, indeed, exhibit the Imperative mode, before which *ὅτι* cannot well stand. But there are cases enough to show, that John's usage, as in the case of other New Testament writers, is very variable in regard to the point in question. In cases where a speaker recites his own words, or delivers his own opinion, and this follows either *λέγει* or *εἶπε*, there is a great number of instances with *ὅτι*, and almost as many without it. The usage is altogether variable in John's Gospel, in regard to this matter. In the Epistle seldom indeed do we find occasion for such a construction. In the Apocalypse *ὅτι* is employed before words cited, when the construction favours it ; see 3: 17. In almost all the cases here of this nature, either a Dative of person follows *λέγει*, which naturally excludes *ὅτι*, (the same in John) ; or else the Imperative, or Imperative in an Optative sense, is employed ; or the Vocative follows ; all of which of course exclude *ὅτι*. The cases where it might be employed, and is omitted, are but few ; my reckoning makes them only some ten or twelve. Add to all this, that the Hebrew אָמַר and לֵאמֹר rarely admit כִּי = *ὅτι* after them. In good Greek, *ὅτι* may be and is employed or omitted *ad libitum scrip-*

toris, before direct quotations; although the insertion is less usual. I am persuaded that nothing can be made of this matter; for the Epistle of John varies greatly and almost as strikingly from the Gospel, in respect to the frequency and the manner of employing ὅτι.

(45) 'When Hebrew words are translated, John exhibits ἑρμενεύεται, and the like, before the translation; which is not found in his Apocalypse;' ib.—The answer to this has already been given on p. 230 seq. above. We may also well say here, that Hebrew poetry does not stop to explain with all the minuteness of prose.

(46) 'The conjunction of both affirmative and negative forms in declaring a thing, is wanting in the Apocalypse, while it is frequent in John.'—*Ans.* Such forms are not wanting in the Apocalypse; e. g. 2: 13. 3: 8, 9, 16, 17. 18: 14. Comp. also the like turns of expression in 2: 2. 9: 6. 10: 9. 11: 5. Even Schott himself appeals to this particular as an evidence of *similarity* between John and the Apocalypse. How differently such matters may strike different minds, when in certain attitudes!

(47) Ewald says, "that in John the relative *praepositive* is frequently separated from the noun to which it belongs, as in Gosp. 12: 18, 37, which is not the case in the Apocalypse," p. 68. The *frequency* of this I cannot find. It is a thing in itself so small, and so purely accidental, or at least depending on concomitant matter which requires a particular position, that nothing can be made out of it worthy of note. And the same may be said of Ewald's alleged separation of words coherent, such as noun and adjective or participle, verb and its object, and the like. There is no difference that is striking or worthy of note. The like discrepancy may be found between the Gospel and the Epistle, or between different portions of the same Gospel. The Hebrew simplicity of constructing sentences in the Apocalypse, is sufficient to account for anything of this nature.

(48) 'Smaller clauses by a *usus bene Graecus*, thrown in by way of explanation, and which might make a kind of parenthesis, are frequent in John, but alien from the Apocalypse;' Ewald, p. 68.—*Ans.* So far is this from being the case, that we often meet with such exegetical or descriptive clauses; e. g. Rev. 2: 9, 24. 3: 9. 4: 9. 5: 5, 8. 8: 3. 9: 17. 11: 5, 16. 16: 14. 18: 15. 19: 8, 10. 21: 25. In nearly all these cases, an editor, who is fond of inserting parentheses, might find a place for them; while in several, they are absolutely demanded. In searching the whole Gospel of John through, I have not found any greater frequency, in proportion, of such epexegetical and descriptive clauses; while in the Epistle they are much rarer, there being but very few cases.

(49) 'John uses a participle *preparatory*, i. e. designating subordinate action, very frequently in connection with the main verb which is to fol-

low; while the participial construction of such a nature is rarely to be found in the Apocalypse.'—*Ans.* The answer to this I have been able fully to make out only by the very laborious process of reading the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse carefully through, and noting all the examples of this nature. The result may be given in a few words. The participle *preparatory*, in the stricter sense, is seldom to be found in the Apocalypse, while it is somewhat frequent in the Gospel, but not to be found at all in the Epistle. So easily may this construction vary, being entirely dependent on the kind of discourse. Historical narrative, which continually gives us views of actions which were connected one with another, and where one was preparatory to another, may admit, or rather may require, the participial construction now before us; while such discourse as the Epistle in the main excludes it, for an obvious reason. In the Apocalypse the series of prophetic vision is presented as mere emblem, and compound, connected, preparatory action in these, in the stricter sense of these words, is rarely to be found. Rarely are two immediately successive verbs exhibited, and where they are, the action is not *subordinate* but co-ordinate. On the other hand, where subordinate action is exhibited, the participial construction is familiar to the Apocalypse; e. g. specially in *λέγων, λέγοντες*, equivalent to *καὶ ἔλεγε, καὶ ἔλεγον*, etc., as in 5: 9. 6: 10. 7: 2, 10, 11, 13. 11: 1, 16. 12: 2. 13: 4, 14. 14: 8, 9, 15, 18. 15: 3. 16: 17. 17: 1. 18: 2, 9 and 10, 15, 18, 21. 19: 4, 5, 17. 21: 9. Some of these hardly differ from the usual participial construction; but most of them naturally take the place of a second verb subordinate, as stated above, the real grammatical principle of the construction being the same as the usual one, i. e. they stand in the place of a verb, and supersede its use. I do not place this common usage in the Apocalypse entirely on the same basis with that in the Gospel, because it is easy to perceive some difference in the nature of the thing. But in the Apocalypse, there is a use of the participle which approaches nearer to a common Hebrew and Chaldee idiom, viz. the employment of it as a verb, without special reference to a *preparatory* and subordinate relation; e. g. Apoc. 1: 16 (bis). 4: 5. 6: 2. 7: 4. 10: 2, 8. 17: 4. 19: 12, 13. In John's Gospel and Epistle are a considerable number of cases, where the Part. is employed as a verb, by the aid of *εἰμί* expressed. In the cases above noted in the Apocalypse, *εἰμί* is omitted. This is nothing strange, considering the rapid and abrupt style of the Apocalypse, and bringing into the account, moreover, that this is very common in Hebrew and Chaldee. The book of Daniel, for example, is full of this idiom. At all events, inasmuch as the *preparatory* participle, in the strict sense, is not to be found in the Epistle, we cannot argue against the Johannean origin of the Apocalypse because it is not employed there in all its classic extent. For the rest,

the participle as *nomen agentis* is frequent in the Apocalypse, and also as an *attributive* both to agent and object. Undoubtedly the full freedom of the Gospel in some respects, as to the use of the Part., is not to be found here; still, the Gospel itself, as I have had occasion to notice in the course of my investigation, employs two successive verbs in some scores of cases, where a participle might have been used for one of them. I do not perceive on the whole, when we consider the *entire absence* of the participial usage in question in the epistle of John, that much can be made out of this case, against the apostolic origin of the Revelation. It was an easy matter to make the objection under examination, from a slight reading of the Apocalypse; but a reply to it founded on facts, must needs cost, as it has, a protracted and most toilsome investigation.

The reader will easily perceive, that the classification which has been made above of the objections to the Apocalypse, under Nos. I. II., is but very general and loose; for a number of the particulars under each category, might with equal propriety have been arranged under the other. Indeed, so miscellaneous are the objections that strict classification is scarcely feasible; nor would any important end be gained by attaining to it. The main point is, to bring the objections fairly before the mind, and properly to consider them.

There remains still a somewhat large class of objections, on which much stress has been laid by some; and these must pass in review before us. I shall rank them, although they are quite miscellaneous, under the following head; viz.

III. Objections deduced from different modes of representation and thought, and from different views, which are presented in John and in the Apocalypse.

Lücke does not pretend to deny, that John may have been Evangelist, Letter-writer, and Prophet or Poet, in the course of his apostolic life. The talent requisite for acting with success in each of these departments, he would not regard as an impossibility or an improbability. But still, conceding this, he cannot satisfy himself how John, acting in any one of these various departments, should have appeared so different from John acting in the other. In particular he appeals,

(50) To the Epistle of John and the Epistles to the seven churches of Asia, between which, he seems to feel, a fair comparison may be instituted. 'The whole tone,' he says, 'of the apocalyptic epistles is entirely different from the epistles of John. Here (in the Apocalypse) we meet with no ἀγαπητοί, no τεκνία μου, and the like; no repetition of the main thought, nor movement in a kind of circle; which are peculiar to John. Both epistles have to deal with heretics and opposers; yet how entirely different the mode of treating them! In John, everything

is referred to love, and faith, and communion with God and Christ and with each other; and by such a spirit, all opposition is to be met and all victories achieved. In the Apocalypse, there is strong and positive blame and severe threatening. The tone is imperative, and magisterial, instead of being gentle and hortatory.'

The picture here drawn may be somewhat overcharged in colouring; yet I think no one can read the epistles to the seven churches, without feeling that there is a manifest discrepancy between the tone and manner of them and the epistle, or epistles, of John. I am not disposed to set aside or even diminish this discrepancy; for the occasion of writing the seven epistles, the manner in which they are evidently formed, and in fact the real author of them, all allow, not to say demand, a discrepancy of manner. Here is a proem to an epic, (if I may so name the book), written in the same spirit as the book itself. The artificial form of the composition is manifest at once; and all seven of the epistles are conformed to one and the same model. I do not mean, that the *matter* of all is the same, but that the arrangement of the parts of each epistle, or in other words its *form*, is throughout fashioned after one model. Each epistle begins with describing the authority and some glorious attribute of the Redeemer; each sets before us a review of the *works* of the church addressed; and each concludes with promises, or threatenings, or both, as the nature of the case demands. Now here is most palpable *triplicity* or *trichotomy*, in accordance with the general structure of the book. Nearly all the epistles, moreover, are of about the same length. Nothing can be more certain, then, than that the structure of them is artificial, and that it is conformed to the *triplicities* of the book throughout. The very tone and manner in which every one of the epistles begins and ends, demonstrate this. And to all this we must add, that from the very nature of the case here presented, it is *Christ* who here addresses the churches, while John is the mere instrument. On the ground of *inspiration*, (which is the one that I stand upon), there is no difficulty in this. A difference of manner, then, is naturally to be expected. There is no proper place here for the mere usual and social and complaisant *ἀγαπητοί, τεκνία μου*, and the like. It was not decorous for the great and glorious Head of the Church, in his majestatic state, to assume the language and mien of a humble apostle and mere fellow-Christian. *Cuique suum.* Even if John were not inspired, and still possessed talent to compose such a book as the one before us, he had talent and judgment enough to make the direct addresses of Christ himself, in such peculiar circumstances, somewhat different from the usual and familiar style of his own writings. Yet in the seven epistles, with all their discrepancies, there is as thorough a manifestation of love, pity, compassionate tenderness, zeal for truth, and hatred of

error and immorality, as can anywhere be found. The manner of expressing these things in the Epistle of John, is indeed different; but the cast of sentiment, after all, is substantially the same. Add to this, that the Johannean τὰ ἔργα pervades the whole of the apocalyptic epistles; and even the favourite οὖν of John, and the ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ὅτι (2: 6), are here employed. Vogel even assigns the epistles, on account of their alleged discrepancy from the rest of the book in respect to style, to a different author. While I regard this opinion, as to difference of authorship, as utterly unfounded, yet that there is a somewhat striking discrepancy of style and manner, must be evident to every one, as seems to me, from attentive perusal. But then again, there are so many resemblances to the rest of the Apocalypse as entirely to overbalance this.

(51) 'In the Apocalypse, the writer has shown that his mind is fraught with a knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, and to them he has everywhere appealed, not directly but indirectly. In the Gospel and Epistle but little of this appears. The writer of the Apocalypse, while handling the themes of the Gospel, would have more frequently appealed to the Old Testament.' Lücke, p. 376.

The Apocalypse is undoubtedly built, as to its modes of representation, on the Old Testament prophets. Hence the very frequent incorporation of their symbols, and modes of representation, with the matter of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the difference between the Gospel and Epistle, as to referring to the Old Testament, is as great as between the Apocalypse and the Gospel. Scarcely any use of the Old Testament is to be found in the Epistle; while in the Gospel it is by no means rare. A matter of this kind must depend altogether on circumstances and the nature of the composition. The like is true of the different epistles of Paul. What right can we have to assume, that John always moved, and must move, in one and the same circle, repeating over and over what he had once said, and always in the same words and phrases? Nothing that we know of him can justly entitle us to such an opinion.

(52) 'The Gospel and Apocalypse present views so entirely different from each other, as to the παρουσία or *advent* of Christ, that the same person could not have been the author of them both. In John's Gospel and Epistle, the advent is regarded altogether as a moral and spiritual matter, as a silent and secret change to take place in the minds of men, and not as a visible and tangible thing. In the Apocalypse, the appeal is to the sensible, the visible, the external; and even if we do not interpret the book after the gross manner of Papias or Montanus, yet the *external* development of Christ's kingdom is the predominant idea of the Apocalypse.'

So Lücke and others; and they urge this matter very strenuously. Lücke concedes, that the *παρουσία* is fully disclosed in the Gospel and Epistle;* but still it is altogether *πνευματικῶς*. 'How could the same John,' he asks, 'who heard and recorded the *spiritual* discourses of Jesus in respect to his coming, while these were still in his mind, have given such a representation as is presented by the Apocalypse?'

The difference of *manner* is indeed somewhat striking. But how could it be otherwise? The one is all poetry, symbol, a world of sacred vision and ideal representation; the other, plain matter of didactic discourse, in which the true nature of the Redeemer's kingdom as spiritual and moral is plainly taught. Still the Apocalypse is neither more nor less than the full completion of Christ's own representation, as contained in Matt. xxiv. and parallel passages, and is clearly of the same nature. And, in my apprehension, it would be just as proper to charge inconsistency upon the Saviour himself, in the representations of his advent as related by John in his Gospel and as exhibited in the passages of the other evangelists just referred to, as it would to allege inconsistency between the Apocalypse and the discourses of Christ in John. How can continued and perpetual symbol appear otherwise than as representing sensible things, if we examine it only partially and cursorily? How many parables of the Saviour respecting his coming and kingdom might be interpreted in the same way? And if so, then they would seem to be contrary to the tenor of others, and to his declaration that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation." The whole objection is built on an exegesis of the Apocalypse which is not tenable. The *visible* and *tangible* and *sensible* is no more at the basis of this work, than it is at the basis of the parables, or of Christ's kingdom as set forth in Matt. xxiv. There are indeed *sensible* things concomitant with the *παρουσία*; and these the Apocalypse has portrayed; while the Gospel and Epistle enter into few or no particulars of this kind. That a kingdom — a reign — a coming — in the Gospel is one thing, and in the Apocalypse substantially another, no one can make out except by a strained and partial exegesis. Will Lücke affirm, that the Apocalypse teaches the *visible* presence and reign of Christ on earth? He has not ventured on this. But if not, why then is not the basis of all the symbol in the Apocalypse the same as in the didactic representations of the Gospel and the Epistle, viz. the ultimate moral and spiritual reign of gospel principles among all nations? It is an idea very common to the Gospel and Epistle of John, and more frequent than elsewhere in the New Testament, Paul's writings excepted, that the salvation of the Gospel is designed for the whole world — for all men. What else is

* He concedes it on the ground of Gosp. 14: 1—3, 23. 16: 7 seq., 15 seq. 17: 24. 3: 18—21. 5: 21—29. 12: 31, 32, 46, 47. 16: 33. 1 John 2: 18 seq. 4: 1 seq.

the Apocalypse, but the symbolical and as it were visible representation of this? The Apocalypse and Gospel are not more discrepant, in respect to the views which they present, than Christ in the parables of Matthew and Luke, is discrepant from the Christ of John. More full, minute, complete representation, when it becomes (as in the Apocalypse) the main object of a work, must differ in many respects from mere *obiter dicta* in a plain and didactic manner. Yet why should they be deemed *inconsistent* with each other? Is there anything in the Apocalypse, which, due allowance for symbol and trope and poetry being made, is inconsistent with the views of the *παρουσία* in the Gospel and Epistle? I do not find it. Are not the *ἕως ἔρχομαι* of Gosp. 21: 22 seq., and the *ὅταν φανερωθῇ* and *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ* of Ep. 2: 28, and the *ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἥξω* of Rev. 2: 25, all of the same cast? And if so, do they not serve as the key to the other representations?

If to the allegation, that the Apocalypse is only a full and completed view of the hints in Matt. xxiv. respecting the coming and kingdom of Christ, one should object that in Matthew and other evangelists that coming is placed only in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, and not with the conquest of heathen enemies, while the Apocalypse fully displays the latter; I would readily concede the fact, that no more than the destruction of Jerusalem is fully presented in the picture by the evangelists. But in the Apoc. vi—xi., is not the same picture again presented? Plainly it is. But then, in this latter work, inasmuch as new enemies and persecutors of the church had appeared, who had not made their appearance when Christ predicted the downfall of Jerusalem, it was greatly to the writer's purpose to extend his views of the triumphs of the cross beyond the boundaries of Judea. The Saviour spoke of what was immediately before him and around him; the Apocalyptist does not contradict this, and is not even at variance with it, because he has extended his views to other enemies of the church besides the Jews.

(53) 'The *Antichrist* of John and of the Apocalypse are altogether different. The latter is a worldly prince, who possesses worldly power and malignity, and persecutes and destroys. The former is an errorist in religion, teaches false principles, and is given to lying and deceit. This opposition is *moral*, and not physical.' So Lücke, p. 383.

But are not in fact the Antichrist of the Epistle and of the Apocalypse, (so to speak), quite different personages? The Antichrist of the Epistle is evidently some one or many apostatizing Christians; *ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν*, Epis. 2: 19. The opposers of religion in the Apocalypse are the unbelieving and persecuting Jews and heathen. Why should not the former be portrayed as errorists in doctrine, and the latter as enemies in external measures, i. e. in persecution and

violence? The adversary in the Apocalypse is like the *ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ ἀντικείμενος, ὁ ἄνομος*, of Paul, in 2 Thess. ii. Lücke seems to have wholly overlooked the fact, that John's Antichrists in his Epistle are *apostates*, while the enemy in the Apocalypse is the unbelieving and persecuting Jew or Heathen. Let it be remembered, too, that much as John, in his Gospel, speaks of opposition to gospel truth, he never once employs there the word *ἀντίχριστος*. It was plainly no particular favorite with him.

(54) 'The Apocalypse teaches a two-fold resurrection; the first, of the saints at the beginning of the Millennium; the second, of all men at the final consummation and general judgment. The Gospel also teaches a two-fold resurrection (5: 21 seq.), but the first simply moral and spiritual. How can representations so different belong to one and the same writer?' Lücke p. 384.

My first remark, in reply to this, is, that the representation in Gosp. 5: 21 seq. belongs entirely to Christ; and, if it be so that a merely *moral* change is here taught, I see no more difficulty in the Saviour's adopting this mode of representation, than there was of Paul's saying: "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." But Lücke's objection depends entirely on the exegesis which he gives to this passage, and which I cannot but regard as altogether improbable, not to say impossible. First, John nowhere else, to say the least, employs this *Pauline* phraseology, in order to indicate a moral and spiritual change. With him it is "Born of God, born of the Spirit, born again." It is therefore against all Johannean analogy to interpret Gosp. 5: 21 seq. in the manner of Lücke. Then the text itself declares the resurrection brought about by Christ, as the resurrection of "*all* who are *ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*,"— of the *good* to everlasting life, and of the *evil* to perpetual condemnation, (v. 29). How can a mere moral and spiritual resurrrection be the one in question here, when the good do not need it, and the wicked do not attain to it? The resurrection of the wicked here, is not their moral *emendation*, but in order that they should be judged and punished. How can this mean their moral regeneration? And if it does, how can they still be condemned and punished? It is impossible to support such an exegesis.—Thus much for the *first* resurrection said to be taught in the Gospel of John. This Gospel teaches plainly the general resurrection only. As to the Apocalypse, I do not well see how we can avoid the exegetical conclusion, that a first and second resurrection is there taught. But I do not take this to be a doctrine new and singular, at the time of John. I shall not, however, go into a discussion of this question here, because I have considered it at some length in § 10, pp. 175 seq. above, and touched upon it also in Excursus VI. on Rev. 20: 4—8; to which I would refer the

reader. It would seem that Jesus himself, and Paul, have at least intimated the like doctrine; and that traces of it may even be found in the Old Testament, and among the early Jewish Rabbins. But even supposing that the writer of the Apocalypse has taught what is nowhere else taught in the New Testament; how would this be any more a valid argument against the *Johannean* authorship of the book, than it is against the *Pauline* origin of 1 Cor., that in this epistle only is taught the giving up by Christ of the mediatorial kingdom at the final consummation of all things, and the subjection of the Son to the Father, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28; and also, that the saints shall judge the world, and judge angels, 1 Cor. 6: 2, 3? Arguments of this nature can prove nothing as to authorship. Does Paul teach the same identical things, and only the same, in all his epistles? Has John exhibited no doctrines in his Gospel, which are not in his Epistle? In his Gospel, it is indeed only the final and general resurrection and judgment that is introduced; but the plan of the Apocalypse, and the development of the Millennium, demanded other corresponding developments not made before.

(55) 'In John, belief brings peace and happiness forthwith. Faith gives a present title to all desirable good, and the reward commences without delay. In the Apocalypse, all the Christian life is contest and struggle and suffering. No happiness is to be expected in the present life, but only in the life to come; and then principally as the reward of fidelity amid persecutions. How can two representations so different proceed from the same pen?' Lücke p. 385 seq.

In the Gospel and Epistle there is indeed peace and joy promised to all believers. The power of true Christianity to bestow these, is represented in a very attractive and forcible manner. The discussion of these topics, however, is here general. No matters that are peculiarly local and temporary are generally regarded, in passages of this nature. But still, is there not an abundance of other passages, which shows the disciples that they will be subjected to persecution and sufferings on account of their attachment to their Lord and Master, and which also fortifies their minds against the fear of these, and comforts them with the assurances of Christ's presence and the aid of his Spirit? He must read with eyes half-closed, who does not often meet with these; e. g. Gosp. 15: 18 seq. 16: 20 seq., 33. In the Epistle, the frequently recurring expression of *overcoming the world* implies the contest of Christians with evil men and with sin. In the Apocalypse, every important circumstance stands on a different footing from that of the simple doctrinal instruction of the Gospel. The writer addresses Christians amidst the fires of persecution. He does not promise them ease, quiet, personal safety, in these circumstances. He knows, and assures them, that persecution is to rage still longer, Rev. 6: 11. Hence, very naturally, he

directs the eye of faith principally to the rewards beyond the grave. Nothing can be more ample or alluring than these, as exhibited by him. Even a part in the first resurrection seems, as he has presented it, to be consequent upon steadfastness in the time of trial. Is there no difference, then, between teaching in a generic way the present and future rewards of Christianity as things that belong appropriately to it, and teaching the doctrine of rewards as appropriate to those who are hurried to the prison-house, the rack, the gibbet, and the stake? It will not be contended however, after all, that there is any important difference between John and the Apocalypse, as to the general idea of a future glorious and immortal life for all true believers. Yet the tropical representations of the Apocalypse in relation to this are more vivid, and attractive, and persuasive, than those in the Gospel; evidently so in consequence of proceeding from a more excited state of mind. But that the Apocalypse *excludes* ideas of internal peace and joy in the present world, as the result of belief or faith, is not for a moment to be supposed, by any one who reads the seven epistles, or the subsequent descriptions of the servants of God who are sealed in their foreheads. In a word, the Apocalypse has made, on the whole, such representations of the Christian's reward as were best adapted to the circumstances of those who were addressed. What hinders us from supposing, that John had a nice sense of *τὸ πρέπον* on occasions of this nature, and that he adapted his encouragements to the nature of the case?

(56) 'In the mode of conceiving and representing some of the leading ideas of the Apocalypse and of the Gospel, there is a great diversity. The evangelist exhibits a kind of Christian Gnosis. In this spirit the prologue to the Gospel is written; and the Logos is the life and light of the world, and all revelations of the Godhead are through and by him. How different the Apocalypse! Here Rabbinic lore and artifice are apparent. God appears as a seven-fold spirit. God in the Gospel is the Father of Christ, and the Father and Friend of men; in the Apocalypse, he is supreme Regent, and governs with justice and vengeance rather than with love. The Apocalypse has no *Paraclete*, and no Christ as *σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*.' Lücke, p. 386 seq.

Is it not enough to say, as to the Gnosis, that the Apocalypse is not designed to be *didactic*, in the like manner as the Gospel? John's Gnosis, if it must so be called, is appropriate in his prologue to a book which exhibits a history of the Logos incarnate. But is there not the same Logos in the Apocalypse? 19: 13. And has any other writer of the New Testament such a recognition as this? To speculate on the Logos-doctrine in the Apocalypse, was out of question. And in regard to the various and diverse attitudes in which God and Christ and the Holy Spirit are said to be exhibited, this is in part to be acknowledged.

But at the same time, what can be more evident than that the Apocalypse, which is a picture of the great contest between the powers of darkness and the great Head of the Church, should, as it does, almost everywhere exhibit God and Christ as supreme and omnipotent and irresistible? In the war that is waged, the attitude of the leaders of the adverse parties is that of commanders and warriors. The Gospel and Epistle of John do not exhibit the contest in such a manner, nor place it in the same light. Here God and Christ are usually represented as judging and making moral retribution. After all, the thing substantially aimed at and accomplished in both writings is the same, viz. *moral retribution*. But the costume of poetry and symbol demands a very different mode of presenting the ideas in question. That God appears rather in the attitude of dispensing *justice*, in the Apocalypse, than of exhibiting *love*, is, as we have seen, a remark of Lücke. But why should he not appear in this way, when the very theme of the Apocalypse is the subjugation of the *enemies* of Christianity? But is there no love to his people, even in all this? Nay, I may well ask: Are there any more attractive pictures, in all the Bible, of the love and pity and tender mercy of God to the obedient, than are to be found in the Apocalypse?

In respect to the *Paraclete*, there is only one passage in John where this peculiar form of presenting to view the aid of the Holy Spirit is exhibited. The doctrine of the influences of the Holy Spirit, however, runs through the Apocalypse, and is abundantly taught. Here, as in John, the Spirit "guides to all truth;" he is the author of all prophecy, of all revelation to the servants of God. Here, as in the Gospel, the Spirit is ascribed to God and to Christ; Rev. 1: 4. 3: 1. 5: 6. 22: 6. Gosp. 14: 16, 25. 15: 26. 16: 7, 14. And as to the *septiform* Spirit, which Lücke attributes to the Apocalypse, I do not find it in Rev. 1: 4. 4: 5. 5: 6, as he represents. I find only the seven ministering spirits or archangels before the throne of God; a Jewish mode of representing this subject, which is at least as old as the book of Tobit (12: 15), and probably goes much farther back. I take the use of *seven* in such cases to be, as it often is, merely a symbolical method of presenting the idea of *completion* or *perfection*. The almost numberless instances of the like kind in the Bible, no one can overlook. I do not call this Rabbinical, but *Jewish*. It is no proof of Rabbinism, (for the Rabbins make *ten* Sephiroth, not seven), but of familiarity with the Jewish custom of symbolizing certain ideas by the use of certain numbers.

(57) The closing suggestions of the preceding paragraph naturally bring us to another objection, briefly touched upon by Lücke, but urged and exemplified by Ewald, p. 35 seq. This is, that 'the Apocalypse approaches much nearer the Cabbalistic lore than any other New Tes-

tament book. Whatever it has respecting angels, demons, Satan, and the like, bears this stamp; and a species of the Cabbalistic *Gematria* even is disclosed in Rev. 13: 18, and Cabbalism in 2: 17, and 21: 1—22: 5, i. e. in the description of the New Jerusalem.' To this Lücke adds, that 'while he concedes that angels are not foreign to John's circle of ideas, yet, in his Gospel, they appear only as performing offices of a moral and spiritual nature,' p. 387 seq.

I cannot enter here upon an exposition of the general angelology of the Scriptures, but must refer the reader to Exc. I. on Rev. 1: 4. From this it is very plain, that John has done no more in the Apocalypse, than to employ the angels in offices assigned and conceded to them in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. That they constitute a part of the supernatural *machinery* (sit venia!) of his moral epic, is plainly true. The frequency with which they appear, and the parts assigned to them, are all in accordance with that general sentiment concerning them, which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has uttered in 1: 14: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who are the heirs of salvation?" In the great contest which the Apocalyptist represents, how could it be that angels should not bear a conspicuous part, in opposition to the spirits of darkness? One may call this *Hebraistic* or *Jewish*, if he pleases; but in it there is nothing which gives just occasion for naming it *Cabbalistic*, or even *Rabbinic* in a technical sense. And when Lücke remarks, that 'the Gospel of John employs angels only on moral and spiritual errands, while the Apocalypse makes them preside over the elements and the phenomena of nature;' one might admit this, and yet appeal from his conclusion. John in his Gospel employs angelic agents, if I may so express it, whenever and wherever the case demands. In the Apocalypse he has done no more. There is no case in the Apocalypse of their interposition, which is not justified by analogy in the Hebrew Scriptures. But is an admission of what Lücke suggests, respecting John's Gospel, to be made with propriety? 'The angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man, (1: 52); the multitude supposing that an angel had spoken to Jesus, (12: 29); the two angels clothed in white, and sitting at the head and feet of Jesus, (20: 12); and above all, the angel at the pool of Bethesda,' (5: 2—7); show that the idea of such agents was familiar to John. But in particular, the last case mentioned above harmonizes in the very thing which Lücke regards as *peculiar* to the Apocalypse, viz. in respect to angelic control over the material elements. I know indeed that Lücke affirms the last clause of v. 3 and the whole of v. 4 to be plainly spurious; and so he easily avoids the force of the argument. But how comes it, that neither Lachmann nor Hahn marks this passage as being doubtful or even suspicious? How

is it that no critical editor of note so marks it, except Griesbach and Knapp? Plainly because the evidence, even on the score of Mss. and Versions, is decidedly in its favour, and because v. 7 would be unintelligible, not to say wholly unmeaning, without the controverted passage. I consider this case on the whole to be so plain, that no reasonable doubt can be entertained respecting it. And such being the case, the doctrine of angelology in the two books of John is so much of the same hue, even as to the speciality in question, as to afford rather a presumption in favour of *sameness* as to authorship than of diversity. The greater frequency of angelic phenomena in the Apocalypse, is to be ascribed to the peculiar nature of the book.

In respect to Rev. 1: 4. 2: 17. 13: 18. 20: 1 seq. being appropriately *Cabbalistic;* there is nothing in them, which decides in favour of this. The *seven spirits* I have already remarked upon above. For 2: 17 I must refer the reader to the Commentary. It expresses a purely Jewish conception, very vivid, however, and truly poetic. The Rabbins have indeed told many putid stories about the *manna* that was laid up in the first temple; but what is there in Rev. 2: 17 which allies it to them? It is merely a poetico-symbolic representation. In respect to 13: 18, I must also refer to the Commentary and the Excursus connected with it. It is there shown, that the passage is quite foreign to the Cabbalistic Gematria; see also p. 141 above. Even Ewald himself, in his commentary, concedes this, or at least he doubts whether it can be put to the account of Gematria. As to chap. xx. seq., which exhibits a picture of the New Jerusalem, I find no more Rabbinism or Cabbalism in it, than I do in Ezek. xl. seq., after which it is most plainly modelled, although still far from being a slavish copy of it. Everything Jewish or Hebrew is not therefore Rabbinic or Cabbalistic. It is indeed true, that the Apocalypse makes an almost surprising use of the numbers three and seven, throughout the book. We have seen its *trichotomy* or *triplicity*, in all its parts great and small; see § 7 above, p. 131 seq. Its *heptades* are also very numerous; ib. p. 144. But the use of neither of these numbers belongs to Cabbalism exclusively. The book of Job is *triplex* throughout. The number *seven* occurs in a symbolical or tropical sense almost everywhere in the Old Testament and the New. It is the *kind* of use only, in respect to these numbers, which distinctly marks Cabbalism; and this is not found in the Apocalypse. In truth, one needs to resort only to Hebrew usages and modes of speech and conception, in order to explain the phraseology of the Apocalypse. Why then should this be called Rabbinic or Cabbalistic? Many things, indeed, which are merely Hebrew or Jewish, appear in the works of Rabbins; but this does not give one the liberty of naming them *Cabbalistic*.

(58) As negative evidence against the *apostolic* origin of the Apoca-

lypse, Ewald (p. 76) says, that 'the author does not call himself the *apostle John*, but only a *worshipper of Christ*.'

But has he called himself the *apostle John*, in his Gospel or Epistle? There were other Johns in his time; why did he not distinguish himself from them in this way? Yet, it seems, he did not. But when the writer of the Apocalypse tells his readers, that he was the John who was in exile at Patmos, and addresses the Asiatic churches as their spiritual Overseer, had he any further need of effort to disclose who was meant?

(59) 'In Rev. 18: 20, the saints and *apostles* and prophets are called upon to exult over fallen Babylon; they are called upon as being in heaven; and the apostles are so spoken of as if the writer did not belong to their number.' Ewald ut supra.

But this cannot amount to much. First, there is nothing in the passage, which makes it clear that the writer considers all of the apostles as already in heaven, any more than he does all of the saints and prophets who are named with them. Indeed, *heaven* may here mean merely the blessed angels and the saints who had already died in the Lord; while the others are addressed as yet on earth. Then, secondly, as to naming the *apostles* collectively, as if the author were not of their number, does not Paul the same in Eph. 2: 20, and yet without any design to exclude himself?

(60) Ewald says, that it would be incompatible with the modesty of John to speak as the Apocalypse does in 21: 14, of "twelve foundation stones [of the new Jerusalem], on which the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb were inscribed." Yet Paul speaks of the church (ut sup.) as "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets; an idea like to that which the Apocalypse brings to view. Paul is sure, that he shall "receive a crown of glory, which the Lord the righteous Judge will give him." He asserts that he is "an ambassador of God;" also that he is "a wise master builder" of the gospel-edifice, 1 Cor. 3: 10; and John says of himself, in his Gospel, that he was "the disciple on whose bosom Jesus leaned—the disciple whom Jesus loved." Can any one justly tax Paul or John with vanity on this account, or with acting contrary to the spirit of modesty? What shall we say of Paul's rapture into the third heaven, and of his being taught directly and personally by the Saviour? In all cases of this nature, there is much to be attributed to the consciousness of the individual in respect to his high office and privilege, the assertion of which is not made in the way of boasting, but for very different purposes.

Lücke thinks that the word *twelve* sounds strange in the mouth of John, inasmuch as Paul would be thereby excluded. But is it not the case, that the apostles are named *twelve* (John 20: 24), even after the death of Judas, and before Paul became an apostle? The word *twelve*

in reference to them became technical; and whether there was one apostle more or less, would make no difference as to employing that word in such a sense. For the rest, the number *twelve* in Rev. 21: 14 was plainly necessary, in order to correspond with the other parts of the description. The apostle Paul would not have supposed himself to be slighted, I trust, by this portion of the Apocalypse. The generic nature of the idea, like that of *apostles* in Eph. 2: 20, seems to me sufficiently palpable, and to relieve the whole thing from any serious difficulty.

Thus have I gone through with the objections to the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse adduced by Lücke; and also noticed some others on which he has not thought proper to rely. One or two more, adduced by respectable writers, may deserve some notice.

(61) 'The Apocalypse represents the government of the world as about to be given to the Messiah, 11: 15 seq.; while heretofore it had been exercised by *angels* as the agents, Rev. 1: 4. 3: 1. 5: 6. 16: 13. 12: 7—9. John exhibits nothing of this nature in his Gospel.'

Thus Schott, p. 481. As to supreme power belonging to the Son or the Messiah, nothing can be more explicit than John; see Gosp. 5: 22—27. 17: 2. 3: 35. In this respect there is the most entire harmony between the Gospel and Apocalypse. Schott must therefore mean only, that *angelic* agency is not so represented in the Gospel as in the Apocalypse. On this I have already spoken above. I must however protest here against making the Apocalypse represent angels as *governing* the world in the higher sense. The Apocalypse ever and always regards them as mere subordinates and instruments. The seven spirits of God, which are of the highest order, and (so to speak) his *presence-angels*, are presented in the Apocalypse (8: 2) as *standing* before his throne, i. e. in the attitude of waiting and obedient servants, ready to receive and execute his commands. And to Christ, let it be noted also, is the possession or dominion of the same seven spirits assigned, Rev. 3: 1. I see nothing in the Apocalypse which assigns a rank to angels different from that assigned to them in the Gospel; see and comp. Rev. 19: 10. 22: 9. 5: 11—14.

(62) 'The Apocalypse assigns dignity to Christ as the *Son of David*, (3: 7. 5: 5. 22: 16); while John assigns it to him as the Logos.'

So Schott, ib. But without any good reason. All three of the passages referred to merely contain quotations from Old Testament prophecy, (Is. 22: 22. 11: 1), and their design is, to describe Christ as the true and predicted Messiah. But the Apocalypse abounds in other reasons than this, why Christ is constituted Lord, and is the object of worship, and why he has uncontrollable supremacy; as we shall see in the sequel. As to the *Logos;* only one passage in the Gospel (1: 1—18) exhibits this appellation, while the Apocalypse ascribes to him the same

appellation and the same rank, 19: 13. Indeed the attitude in which, in several respects, Christ is placed, in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse, and the attributes and works ascribed to him in both, constitute a leading and striking trait of resemblance between the two books; as we shall soon see.

Other objections have been made to the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse, by Corrodi, Oeder, Semler, and some other writers, who harmonized with them in their contempt for this book. But they are of such a character, that neither Schott, Ewald, Lücke, or Credner, have thought it best to rely on them, or even to adduce them. It will not, therefore, be deemed necessary that I should discuss them here. All that is relied upon, at present, has already been adduced.

I might now proceed to give a summary or result of this discussion respecting the *internal* evidence of the Apocalypse in regard to authorship; but there is another part of the testimony which is yet to be heard. *Both sides must be examined, before we make up our opinion.* Internal testimony in favour of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse is not wanting; and this remains to be heard.

§ 22. *Internal evidence in favour of John as the author.*

Such is the peculiar nature of the Apocalypse—a series of emblems or symbols from beginning to end—such the personages, scenes, occurrences, places, etc., which pass in review or under the inspection of the prophetic seer, that we find ourselves, in fact, transferred to a world which is new and in many respects strange. How was it possible, in writing such a book on such a plan, that the diction, the phraseology, the ideas, the scenery, and in a word the whole contour of the book, should not be very diverse from such a work as the *didactic* Gospel of John; a great part of which is either doctrinal discussion, or else matter of a paranaetic nature? In respect to a writer of any talent—any distinguished original powers of mind and imagination—one might easily decide *a priori* that there must be many discrepancies between two such performances. We have seen that there are many. Some of them, certainly, are striking; and if the object and design of the Gospel and the Apocalypse were of the same nature, we could hardly account for it, that the same writer should differ so much from himself. As it is, these discrepancies are less striking. We expect many of them, when we see how closely the Apocalyptist has followed in the train of the Hebrew prophets. Others we might not expect, which however have analogies in the different works of Paul and Luke. Considerations like these serve to abate, in some measure, the strength of the first impressions, which are made on us by the consideration of merely the

discrepancies between the diction and views of the Gospel and Apocalypse. But this is not all. There remains some positive internal evidence, in the Apocalypse, of its being *Johannean*, at least some that appears to be of such a character, which has not yet been developed, and to the exposition of which we would now advance.

I begin with the DICTION and PHRASEOLOGY; after that, the SENTIMENTS or VIEWS of the writer will come under consideration.

(1) One of the most striking traits of resemblance is presented by the fact, that the favorite *μαρτυρέω* and *μαρτυρία* of the Gospel, in the sense of *declaration* respecting the Saviour and his mediatorial work, *public profession* and *declaration* of belief in him, is so common in the Apocalypse. Thus in the Gosp., 1: 7, 19. 3: 11, 32, 33. 5: 31—36. 8: 13, 14. 18: 35. 21: 24. Epist. 5: 9 (tris), 10, 11, al. Comp. Rev. 1: 2, 9. 6: 9. 12: 11, 17. 19: 10. 20: 4. 22: 18, 20. Most striking are these last two verses compared with Gosp. 21: 24. One can hardly refrain from the feeling, that the same hand must have penned both passages. And this the more, because out of John's works, there is scarcely any usage of this peculiar and appropriate kind to be found. Lücke merely observes, in answer to this, that *μαρτυρία Ι. Χριστοῦ* is not found in the Gospel. But is it not virtually and plainly in Gosp. 3: 11. 5: 31, 32. 8: 13, 14?

(2) The use of *νικᾶν* in the sense of *overcoming the evil and opposition and enmity* of the world, with the implication of remaining faithful and active in the Christian cause, is peculiar to John and to the Apocalypse; comp. Gosp. 16: 33. Epist. 2: 13, 14. 4: 4. 5: 4, 5. Apoc. 2: 7, 11, 17, 26. 3: 5, 12, 21. 12: 11. 15: 2. 21: 7. Besides these examples, Rom. 12: 21 affords the only instance of the kind in the New Testament. This peculiarity, so frequent, seems to be almost as striking as the one above. It is not a thing which belongs to common Hellenism, and therefore it affords the stronger evidence of sameness of authorship.

(3) *Ὄψις*, in the sense of *human visage*, is to be found only in Gosp. 11: 44 and Rev. 1: 16. No other New Testament writer employs it.

(4) *Τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον* is frequent in John's Gospel and Epistle; the same occurs often in the Apocalypse. I do not include in this the phrase *τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς*, which is the common property of Hellenistic Greek, modelled after the Hebrew idiom. But *τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον* belongs only to John. So *τηρεῖν ἐκ*, Gosp. 17: 15 and Apoc. 3: 10; elsewhere not.

(5) *Σκηνοῦν* is used in Gosp. 1: 14 and Apoc. 7: 15. 12: 12. 13: 6. 21: 3. Elsewhere it is not found. Although in the Gospel it is predicated of the Logos, yet the idea of the verb is the same as in the Apocalypse.

(6) *Σφάττειν* is employed in Epist. 3: 12 (bis); also in Rev. 5: 6. 9: 12. 6: 4, 9. 13: 3, 8. 18: 24. Found nowhere else.

(7) *Ἔχειν μέρος* is used in Gosp. 13: 8 and in Apoc. 20: 5. That in the first case it is followed by *μετά* and the Genitive, and in the second by *ἐν* and the Dative, does not affect the peculiarity of the idiom, as Lücke supposes. This consists in the formula itself, *ἔχειν μέρος*. The manner of the sequel is dictated by the nature of the sentiment.

(8) *Περιπατεῖν μετά τινος*, Gosp. 6: 66. Apoc. 3: 4.—*Σφραγίζειν*, Gosp. 3: 33. 6. 27 in the sense of *confirmed, authenticated;* like to this, but applied to the *persons* of men, in Apoc. vii.; not merely and simply *marked*, as Lücke translates it.

(9) *Ἀπάρτι*, Gosp. 1: 52. 13: 19. 14: 7. Rev. 14: 13. Elsewhere only in Matthew. The verb *δεικνύω* or *δείκνυμι* occurs with unusual frequency in the Gospel and Apocalypse. But this is common property. —*Ἑβραϊστί* in Rev. 9: 11. 16: 16. Gosp. 5: 2. 19: 13. 17: 20. Elsewhere not found.—*Κοπιάω* in the sense of *fatigue*, Rev. 2: 3. Gosp. 4: 6. Not elsewhere in this sense, excepting perhaps Matt. 11: 28.

(10) *Λαλεῖν μετά τινος*, Gosp. 4: 27. 9: 37. 14: 30. Rev. 1: 12. 4: 1. 10: 8. 17: 1. 21: 9, 15. Elsewhere not, excepting once in Mark 6: 50. *Προσκυνεῖν* is said by Kolthoff (Joan. Apoc. Vindic. p. 114), to be constructed both with the Accusative and Dative only in Gospel and Apocalypse; elsewhere only with the Dative. But Luke 4: 8. 24: 52, exhibits the Accusative. Elsewhere it is with the Dative. The frequent exchange of these cases, however, in the Gospel and Apocalypse, is notable.—*Οὐρανός* in the Gospel and Apocalypse has almost constantly the *article*, in all circumstances; less frequently elsewhere. The like remark may be made as to *ὁ Χριστός*. And *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, so common in Paul, occurs not in any part of John.

(11) *Κύριε, σὺ οἶδας*, Gosp. 21: 15—17 tris. Rev. 7: 14.—*Ἀπεκρίθη λέγων*, Gosp. 1: 26. 10: 33. Rev. 7: 13. The peculiarity is, that John never in such cases employs *ἀποκριθείς*, the participle.

(12) The failure of certain words so common in the New Testament, throughout the writings in question, is rather striking; e. g. of *μετάνοια, γέεννα*. On the other hand, the frequent use of *φῶς, φωτίζω, δόξα, φαίνω*, and the like, in a tropical sense, in the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, shows a similarity of colouring in the style. The comparison of Christ with the *bridegroom*, in Gosp. 3: 29 should be placed by the side of Rev. 19: 7. 21: 2. 22: 17; not so much on account of the general relation indicated by it, which is frequent in the Scripture, as the diction. There is a similarity, also, between the mode of expression in Rev. 3: 20, and Gosp. 10: 27. 10: 1. 14: 23. So of the *water of life*, Rev. 22: 17. 21: 6, and Gosp. 7: 37. 4: 10. Comp. also Gosp. 4: 14. Rev. 22: 1. So of *hungering* and *thirsting*, Rev. 7: 16. Gosp.

6: 35. So a *tropical* sense for the word θερισμός, Rev. 14: 15. Gosp. 4: 35, (differently applied, but still tropical); ἄμπελος, Rev. 14: 18. Gosp. 16: 1, is common to both books, although applied also in a different way, as it easily might be. The image of *cup*, for *suffering, trial*, Gosp. 18: 11, is very common in the Apocalypse. The image of Christ as a *shepherd*, Gosp. 10: 1 seq., is presented in Rev. 7: 17, ποιμανεῖ καὶ ὁδηγήσει.

(13) Striking is the use of *Lamb* as applied to the Saviour, Gosp. 1: 29, 36. In the Apocalypse some twenty-five times. Nowhere else in the New Testament is this employed, except twice in quoting from Is. 53: 7. John employs the form ἄμνος, but is familiar also with the other form, ἀρνίον, 21: 15; the Apocalypse uses only the neuter form, ἀρνίον. But the meaning is the same. The phrase or appellation originated in the expiatory death and innocent character of Christ, and seems to be employed so often in the Apocalypse in order to keep this in view.

(14) Μετὰ ταῦτα, for the most part as a mere formula of transition, equivalent or nearly so to δέ, οὖν, is a striking feature of resemblance between the Apocalypse and Gospel; e. g. Gosp. 3: 22. 5: 1, 14. 6: 1. 7: 1. 13: 7. 19: 38. 21: 1. Apoc. 1: 19. 4: 1. 7: 1, 9. 9: 12. 15: 5. 18: 1. 19: 1. 20: 3. Luke occasionally employs the same formula; but not with the frequency that is common to the two books just named. The Gospel also employs μετὰ τοῦτο, in three or four instances, in the same sense as μετὰ ταῦτα. Of course we might expect to find in the Gospel a greater variety of usage in respect to the particles, or words equivalent to them, than in the Apocalypse, which is thoroughly pervaded by the Hebrew element.

(15) The Apocalypse frequently employs Hebrew words, and then adds a Greek explanation of them; which John also does in his Gospel. E. g. Rev. 3: 14. 9: 11. 12: 9. 20: 2. 22: 20. Gosp. 1: 39, 42, 43. 9: 7. 19: 13, 17. This is occasionally done elsewhere; but the frequency in these books is a circumstance worthy of note.

(16) Γράφειν, followed by εἰς before the noun signifying the object on which the writing is made, is peculiar to the Apocalypse and Gospel; e. g. Apoc. 1: 11. Gosp. 8: 6, 8. This is such a speciality in construction as merits particular notice; elsewhere the Dative with ἐν is employed to designate the like relation, e. g. 1 Cor. 5: 9.

(17) That the doctrine of *perseverance* is common to both writings, may readily be supposed. It is not merely because it is found in both, that I reason in favour of sameness of authorship; but because the mode in part of expressing the sentiment, even when mingled with a highly figurative context, in the Apocalypse, bears a resemblance to John's method. Thus Rev. 3: 12, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι, may be compared with

Ep. 2: 19, where ἐξῆλθον ἐξ ἡμῶν is said of heretics. Gosp. 6: 37. comp. 10: 28, 29.

(18) The use of σημαίνω in Gosp. 12: 33. 18: 32. 21: 19, and in Apoc. 1: 1, may deserve a passing notice, inasmuch as the word is found but twice elsewhere in the New Testament, viz. Acts 11: 28. 25: 27.

(19) The *neuter* gender is used to express rational beings, in Gosp. 6: 37, 39. 17: 2, 10. So κτίσμα in Rev. 5: 13 al.; πᾶν, 21: 27.

(20) If διά with Acc. as indicative of *means*, *instrumentality*, is to be admitted in the New Testament, (and I think it must be), it would seem to be confined to the writings of John; at least other cases are somewhat doubtful. See Apoc. 12: 11, διὰ τὸ αἷμα and διὰ τὸν λόγον; 13: 14, διὰ τὰ σημεῖα. Gosp. 6: 57. But even in these cases, the *instrumental* sense is doubted by some. See Win. Gramm. § 53. c.

(21) John, Gosp. 19: 34—37, has given an account of piercing the Saviour's side with a spear; and he only has given it. To this he applies the prediction in Zech. 12: 10, "They shall look on him whom דָּקָרוּ, *they have pierced*." John renders this last Hebrew word by ἐξεκέντησαν, while the Seventy have ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο; having probably read the Heb. דָּקְדוּ by an easy mistake of ד and ר. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, all translate by ἐξεκέντησαν; but they were posterior to the Apocalypse and Gospel. Apoc. 1: 7 exhibits the same version as in the Gospel. As this version must be the effect of translating *de novo*, it looks much like the same hand in both passages. Ewald, in order to avoid the force of this, suggests that the Septuagint may have once read ἐξεκέντησαν, and been afterwards altered; also that two different persons might have hit upon the same translation. Either of these cases is possible; but the first is wholly improbable. And inasmuch as John is the only Evangelist who gives an account of piercing the side of the Saviour, and who applies the passage in Zechariah to this occurrence, it looks very much like the same hand in both passages, and like the same mind appreciating the circumstance of the wounded side in the same way. On Ewald's ground, I do not see how the Sept. Version can ever be appealed to in such cases. The different constructions in the Gospel and Apocalypse, ὄψεται εἰς ὅν and ὄψεται εἰς αὐτόν, in connection with ἐξεκέντησαν, are occasioned merely by the construction of the respective sentences in which they stand, and make nothing in favour of different translators.

We come now to those traits which might be ranged under the category of DOCTRINAL. It is my principal object to bring into view those things which have respect to the character and work of the *Redeemer*; for most of what there is in the book, which is of a special doctrinal nature, has reference more or less to the great Head of the church, who leads on his armies to victory.

(22) The appellation λόγος, as distinctive of *person*, occurs only in the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse. Thus Gosp. 1: 1, 14. Ep. 1: 1. 5: 7. Apoc. 19: 13. When Lücke says, that 'John nowhere names Christ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, as the Apocalypse does; might not one reply and say: John nowhere says λόγος τῆς ζωῆς except in Ep. 1: 1, and is it therefore to be argued that John the evangelist did not write the Epistle? The truth is, that no other writer of the New Testament uses at all the personal appellative in question; and it seems to be purely *Johannean*. That as an appellation of a *person*, it has the like sense in the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, there can be no room for doubt. In the Gospel, John attaches to it various considerations, some of them of a speculative, high, and mysterious nature. But in the Apocalypse, the nature of the case does not permit him to *theologize*. The circumstance of such a usage is entitled to our special consideration.

(23) The Christology of the Apocalypse, in respect to the dependence of the Saviour on God the Father for his *doctrines* and *instructions*, is strikingly in unison with that of John. In Rev. 1: 1, the *revelation* of Jesus Christ is asserted to be *that which God gave him*, in order that he might teach it to others. Let the reader now compare Gosp. 17: 7, 8. 5: 19, 20. 7: 16. 8: 28. 12: 49. 14: 10, and he will see how exactly this shade of meaning agrees in both books. Elsewhere in the New Testament different modes of expressing this relation may be found; but they are unfrequent, and wanting in the special resemblance here indicated.

(24) The views of the Gospel and Apocalypse respecting the dignity and glory of the Saviour, are of the same cast, each elevating him to the highest degree. Thus in the Gosp. 1: 1—18. 5: 20—29. 6: 62. 8: 54—58. 10: 28—30. 12: 41. 17: 1—5. Comp. Rev. 1: 5 seq. 3: 21. 5: 6—13. 7: 17. 11: 15. 12: 5. 14: 1. 19: 10—13. 21: 23. 22: 13—16. In 2: 17 the implication is, that his name is equivalent to יְהוָה.

(25) That Christ is a Saviour for all the human race, Jews and Gentiles, is an idea frequent in John and in the Apocalypse, Gosp. 3: 16. 10: 16. 11: 51, 52. 12: 32. Ep. 2: 2. 4: 14. Apoc. 5: 9. 7: 9. 21: 25, 26. 22: 2. This doctrine is common in the writings of Paul; but the shape of it in the books above named, is different from that in Paul's Epistles.

(26) The *omniscience* of Christ is often alluded to both in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse, Gosp. 1: 49. 2: 24, 25. 4: 17, 18. 6: 61, 64, 70. 13: 1, 11, 18, 21. 16: 29, 30. 21: 17. Apoc. 1: 1. 2: 2, 9, 13, 19, 23. 3: 1. 8: 15. Why Bretschneider and Schott should say, that the Apocalypse represents Christ only as knowing the ἔργα, the *external works*, of men, while the Gospel represents him as searching the heart, I know not. Rev. 2: 23 says: "All the churches shall know, that I [Christ] am he *who searches the reins and the hearts*, and I will give to

every one of you according to your works." Besides, ἔργα is not to be taken in the limited sense of *external* works merely. It includes the *character* of those works; which can be estimated only by a knowledge of the state of mind that accompanied them.

(27) The *piacular* death of Christ is a doctrine which pervades the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, and in a similar way. As examples I refer only to a few cases. Gosp. 1: 29, 36. 3: 16. 6: 51. 10: 15, 18. Ep. 1: 7. 2: 2. 4: 10. Apoc. 1: 5. 5: 9. 7: 14. 12: 11. 14: 4. This doctrine is indeed taught by nearly all the writers of the New Testament; but the form in which it is elsewhere developed, differs somewhat from the Johannean.

It were easy to extend the comparison that we have been making to many other particulars both of language and of doctrine. This has indeed been already done by Schulze, Donker Curtius, and others. But I have not much confidence in arguments of this nature, when pushed beyond moderate limits. In fact, a considerable portion of the arguments of such a kind, if indeed they may be called arguments, which are employed either in assailing or defending the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, weigh but little in the estimation of those who are familiar with topics of such a nature. The reasons for such a judgment upon the case I shall give in the sequel, when we come to the inquiry: What is the result of the internal evidence? To this we are now ready to come; asking the liberty, however, before the answer is specifically made out, of premising various considerations of which we ought to take cognizance, and which should have their proper influence in making up our minds as to the final result.

§ 23. *Result.*

AND NOW WHAT SAYS CRITICAL JUDGMENT AND CONSCIENCE? A question differently answered, as it appears, by different persons. Indeed, such is the case before us, that we can hardly expect unanimity among critics at present. In Germany, as one might almost conclude from a survey of the late writers, they seem to be approaching to an agreement in opinion, that the Apocalypse is not to be attributed to John the Evangelist. Yet very recently a number of writers here and there have come forward in vindication of its Johannean origin. How the question is and will be decided, would seem in many cases to stand intimately connected with a kind of general judgment concerning the Apocalypse, which is based upon its mysterious form and contents, and upon preconceived notions of its obscurity and inutility to the church, rather than on any profound critical examination of the whole matter.

Such was notoriously the judgment of Luther. In his Preface to the

Apocalypse, which he at first printed as an apocryphal book, he says: "More than one thing presents itself in this book, as a reason why I deem it to be neither apostolical nor prophetic. First, and most of all, that the apostles do not concern themselves with visions, but prophesy in plain and unadorned words; as Peter, Paul, and Christ in the Gospel, do; for it belongs to the apostolic office, clearly and without simile or vision to speak respecting Christ and his work. Moreover, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, to say nothing of the New, who is through and through occupied with visions; so that I almost imagine to myself a fourth book of Ezra before me, and certainly can find no reason for believing that it [the Apocalypse] was composed by the influence of the Holy Spirit."—After suggesting some objections to the claims which the Apocalypse makes for itself, he proceeds: "Let every one make up his opinion respecting it [the Apocalypse], as he judges best. My mind cannot adapt itself to the book, and it is reason enough for me not to prize it very highly, that Christ is neither taught nor acknowledged in it; which is the great business of an apostle."

This last reason of Luther is, as I have before remarked, the most extraordinary of all; for if there be any book in the New Testament, which is *all Christ*, from beginning to end, that book is the Apocalypse. His coming, his kingdom, his triumph over all enemies, his protection of his suffering people, his atoning blood, its universal efficacy, his majesty, his omniscience, his omnipotence, his judgment of the world, his magnificent preparation for the future blessedness of the saints—in a word, his coming in all its glory and excellence, with all its present and future results—these are the themes, the constant unchanging themes, of the Apocalypse. Are his enemies brought upon the scene of action? It is but to display his power and glory in subduing and humbling them. Is the world of light and love opened to his faithful followers? It is he who has opened it; he "who has redeemed them to God by his blood, out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation; he who has made them kings and priests unto God forever and ever."

To say, moreover, that there are no *visions* in the Gospels, in Peter, and in Paul, sounds strangely in our ears. Follow Peter in the book of Acts; and see what he says in 2 Pet. 1: 18 seq. Follow Paul, also, in the book of Acts; and consult him in 2 Cor. xii. Brief, indeed, are the accounts of trances and visions, and not protracted like those in the Apocalypse. But who can show the impossibility, or the improbability, of a book mainly or purely *prophetic*, in the New Testament? And if so, why is not the *costume* to be prophetic? When Luther says, that 'no prophet even of the Old Testament so indulges in visions as the author of the Apocalypse,' is this correct, when applied to Dan. vii—xii, i. e. the prophetic part of the book? And is not Ezekiel an almost un-

interrupted series of visions? And so of Zech. i—vi. The "plain and unadorned words," which Luther insists on as characteristic of the apostles' teaching, and also of the Saviour's, if meant to exclude tropical language, and parable, and similitude, is a mistake sufficiently obvious. Such a continuous series of symbols cannot, indeed, be found in any other book of the New Testament; but what other book is *prophetic*?

That Luther afterwards modified his opinion, in the progress of his controversy with "the scarlet beast," is well known. But his opinion, as an affair of *criticism*, is hardly to be spoken of here. Nothing can be more evident, than that he had not well studied the book which he condemns; for otherwise he could not have so misconceived of its contents. I mention his case here again, merely because it casts light on the grounds on which the sentence of condemnation, in respect to the book before us, sometimes rests. Luther is not alone in forming a judgment of this character, and on like grounds.

In quite recent times, the Apocalypse has received but a small share of critical attention in Germany. In England and America, nearly all the writers upon it have assumed more the character of *prophets* than of critics. They make it a *syllabus of universal history*, civil and ecclesiastical; and each finds the corresponding events, according to fancy or traditional exegesis. There is, of course, no end to diversity of opinion, and no basis on which any one theory can be firmly built. So much have *a priori* views, and traditional views of one kind and another, guided the decision of most writers in regard to the supposed contents of the book, and also in respect to the origin and authority of the book itself.

It scarcely need be said, that we are to guard ourselves against everything of this kind, when we come to make up our final judgment respecting the origin and character of the book before us. Whether the book may stand or fall, can be decided, and ought to be decided, on no other ground than that of argument and reason such as sound criticism can approve. Our prejudices, our theology, our apprehensions of the unprofitableness, or even of the evil tendency of the mysterious and the undefined which seem to pervade the Apocalypse, ought not to control our judgment, whether the apostle John wrote the book. The evidence does not depend on our subjective feelings, but on objective facts and testimony.

Thus much will be conceded by every impartial and critical inquirer. But how shall all be brought to pass the same sentence in respect to the weight of internal and external evidence? This is a matter which, at present, seems to be beyond the reach of any one. But while I doubt not, that many will not accede to the opinion which I have formed respecting the authorship of the Apocalypse, it will not be out of place

for me to suggest some specific grounds or reasons, why I think that less dependence is to be placed on the *internal* evidence, conditioned as it now is, than most of the recent critical investigators are wont to put upon it.

(1) There is no man of talent, who has a ready flow of words at his command, and employs himself with any frequency in writing, who will always confine himself to the same round of *diction* and *phraseology*, even when expressing the same thoughts. Occasionally his *personal* idiom (if I may so speak) will make its appearance. There are some general qualities of style also, such as perspicuity, energy, brevity of expression, and the opposite qualities, which will, for the most part, extend themselves to the writings in general of any individual; qualities that often result more from personal feeling, than from any influence of mere education over one's style. As a general principle, the traits of one piece of composition will develope themselves in another which is from the same hand, provided the pieces are written nearly at the same time, in like circumstances, and on kindred topics. But how numerous are the examples, both in poetry and prose, of persons who have written some one or more pieces with great spirit and power, and who have never, before or afterwards, achieved anything in the way of composition that will bear comparison with those pieces, either in respect to matter or manner? The diversity in this respect is exceedingly great. There are men, who form their habits of expression even in early youth, and cleave to them everywhere and at all times through life. There are others, who not only change very much at different periods of life and practice, but who are so influenced by reading and thinking, that they are always changing their style in some degree. No universal maxim can be laid down, in respect to mutability of style. Examples in abundance can easily be produced, seemingly adequate to establish opposite conclusions in respect to this subject. This ought to teach us caution as to relying upon any uniform and established principle in relation to this matter. *Uniformity*, even as a general thing, cannot well be established.

(2) If such uniformity might be established as a general principle in respect to prose, or in regard to poetry, i. e. in respect to each particular kind of composition by itself considered, yet it would prove little or nothing in respect to the different compositions of poetry and prose. A man of small talent and very limited resources might write poetry and prose, indeed, in very nearly the same way. Of his poetry it might be said: *Nisi pede differt, sermo merus.* All his productions, in such a case, might have one and the same stamp, easily recognized and almost surely distinguished. But was John a man of this character? Does the speculative and doctrinal character of his Gospel develope a mere or-

dinary and common-place thinker? Or does the very frequent use of metaphor and trope in this book, show him to have been a man of sluggish or barren imagination? Methinks the man *on whose bosom Jesus leaned*, and *whom Jesus loved*, must have had some rare and striking qualities. And who so fit a person as he, to entrust with the deeply interesting disclosures of the Apocalypse?

It is a conceded point, as has often been mentioned, that the Apocalypse is virtually a book of *poetry* — of prophetic Hebrew poetry, in regard to its costume. As we have already seen, no book in the New Testament has so much Hebraism in it, or leans so much on the Old Testament, in respect to its form and manner, as the Apocalypse. Such being notoriously the fact, does it not follow, almost as a matter of course, that this book must differ, in a great variety of respects, from a book of didactic discourses, or a plain and familiar epistle of caution, warning, and exhortation? To suppose that John must exhibit the same thoughts, phrases, and words, in each of these very diverse compositions, is to suppose him to have been a very common-place writer, and very dull in his apprehension of things, or of the proper manner of representing them. In fact, the diversity of style, in such a case, would depend on several things, viz., on the different degrees of excitement in the writer's mind, on the different circumstances in which he was placed when he wrote, or the difference of his theme, and on the taste and talent of the writer. I do not mean to exclude the idea of inspiration. I believe and admit it. But nothing is more certain, at the same time, than that the sacred writers both of the Old Testament and of the New, have all developed their own respective *personal* traits and talents as conspicuously as the Latin, Greek, or English writers have done. Inspiration does not subdue or conceal all that is personal and characteristic. I might perhaps even say, that it serves to bring it out more prominently to view. We need not hesitate, therefore, to speak of the diverse traits of John's writings, as being the natural result of the diverse compositions, and of the different circumstances in which they were written, as well as of the probably different periods of time when they were undertaken. I know of no argument against this mode of reasoning, which would not banish from the Bible all distinction of style, and reduce all its very various compositions to one and the same standard as to their aesthetical character.

I am aware that Lücke has more than once cautioned us not to rely on any *difference of time*, (which would amount to anything in the way of affecting the style of John), between the writing of the Apocalypse and of the Gospel and Epistle. Yet the *probability* of considerable difference, I hardly think can be reasonably denied; and the progress of John, as to familiarity with the Greek, *ad interim*, must have been

considerable. All these things are at least to be taken into view, in making our final estimate.

(3) There is not, as I verily believe, a single Epistle of Paul, which might not be rejected from the canon for want of genuineness, in case the arguments against it might be made out in the same way as they are against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse. We will take for example one of the least controverted of all the Pauline epistles, viz. the first Epistle to the Corinthians. For the purpose of illustrating my meaning, I must crave the liberty merely to touch upon some of the arguments, which might be brought forward against the genuineness of this undoubted epistle.

(*a*) 'It is a most extraordinary affair, and yet matter of fact, that there are, in this epistle of only sixteen chapters (many of which are short), no less than 230 ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, i. e. words never found in any other of Paul's epistles. How was it possible that the same writer should have so far departed from the usual circle of his diction, within bounds so narrow?'—This mode of argumentation is not indeed formally brought forward, at present, in respect to the Apocalypse, but it is virtually so, when appeal is made to so many words found in the Apocalypse, and not in the Gospel and Epistle. Such an appeal can prove nothing; or if it does, it proves a great deal too much. E. g. in the brief epistle to the Philippians may be found fifty-four ἅπαξ λεγόμενα; in Galatians, fifty-seven; in Ephesians and Colossians, one hundred and forty-three; in 1 Timothy, eighty-one; in 2 Timothy, sixty-three; in Titus, sixty-four, etc. (See Note in Kolthoff, p. 110). And so it must be with every writer, who has anything to say which he has not said before. Paul and John fairly belong, in my apprehension, to this class of writers. But,

(*b*) I have been through the first Epistle to the Corinthians *seriatim*, and sought out all the words and phrases and thoughts which are *peculiar* to this epistle; and such a list of them have I found and made, that one could at first scarcely believe the result, and yet believe that the epistle belongs to Paul, provided the mode of reasoning in question be adopted. I will not repeat here, what I have elsewhere (Comm. on Heb. p. 219 seq. edit. 2) submitted to public view. But there is not a chapter, in which one cannot find either words or phrases nowhere else employed by Paul, or else phraseology which expresses an idea that he has signified in a different way in his other writings. Such words and phrases not only amount to some scores, but to several hundreds. There is scarcely a case of phraseology in the Apocalypse, which is appealed to in order to disprove its apostolic origin, the like of which is not repeatedly to be found in the epistle before us. If the reader has any doubt of this, I must refer him, for the solution of his doubt, to the ex-

hibition of words and phrases which is made in the work above referred to. Indeed the instances are so numerous, that it would be out of place to repeat them here. At all events, the facts just stated cannot be called in question by any one, who will thoroughly attend to and examine the subject. Then,

(*c*) 'On the score of *doctrine*, there is still more objection to be made to the *Pauline* origin of this epistle. First the absence of favourite Pauline subjects of discussion is striking. What is there here of the great question about justification by faith without the deeds of law? What respecting the vanity and folly and presumption of *Judaizing* teachers? What of the worthlessness of Jewish rites and ceremonies? What of the equal rights of Jews and Gentiles in the Gospel-Church? Then, secondly, we find the discussion of many topics here, which are not elsewhere touched upon. The subject of spiritual gifts, although elsewhere adverted to, is nowhere placed in such a light as here. Then comes the marriage relation, which must have presented the like questions in other churches, but of which Paul says nothing like what is said in this epistle. Where has this apostle given such minute directions about the dress, demeanor, and rights of women, as are in the first to the Corinthians? Where has he discoursed, in the like way, upon the Lord's Supper; on the support of preachers; and on the comparative influence of faith, hope, and love? Where has he said anything about the resurrection of the dead, in such a peculiar manner as he has discussed this subject in 1 Cor. xv.? Where else has he intimated anything about being *baptized for the dead*? 1 Cor. 15: 29. Above all, where has he or any other sacred writer, said anything about *the subjection of the Son to the Father*, at the final consummation of all things, like to that which is said in 1 Cor. 15: 24—28? Where has either Paul, or any other sacred writer, elsewhere taught that *the saints will judge the world, and will judge angels*, as is taught in 1 Cor. 6: 1—3? Where, in Paul's epistles, is a *first* and *second* resurrection taught; as it seems plainly to be in 1 Cor. 15: 23, 24?' (Comp. ἀπαρχή . . . ἔπειτα . . . εἶτα, as noting distinct and successive events in their order; and see De Wette's Comm. in loc.).

Such is the array of objections which lie upon the face of the first epistle to the Corinthians. And this list might easily be swelled out to a much greater extent, if a doubter in the genuineness of this epistle should feel so disposed toward it, as Corrodi, Oeder, Semler, and many others, have done toward the Apocalypse. Nothing is easier than to get up such questions, and bring forward such difficulties. Every ancient or modern writing is exposed to them. And if, in themselves, they were sufficient to determine the question of genuineness, we should

have but few genuine writings in all antiquity, among authors who have written much and on a variety of subjects.

It is not my impression, that a man of so much candour as Lücke seems to possess, means to write in such a spirit as Corrodi and Semler. But having taken his position with so full assurance (see p. 285), he cannot but feel an interest to press into his service all that can well be employed in such a way. For example; when he comes (p. 369 seq.) to review the words and phrases in the Apocalypse. which are alleged to be like others in John, he lays hold of the most minute circumstances of construction in the context in order to make out a difference, even in cases where this construction was required by the nature of the enunciation. The same process applied to the first epistle to the Corinthians would make an enormous list of discrepancies from Paul elsewhere. In fact it is my full persuasion, after having gone through such a minute and laborious process of comparison, that the *internal* evidence against the genuineness of the first to the Corinthians is decidedly greater, whether we refer to diction and phraseology or to doctrine, than the like evidence in the Apocalypse is, against its apostolic origin. Any man who holds these two writings in the balance, if he decides against either on the ground of *internal* evidence, must decide against both.

Yet Lücke, Ewald, Schott, De Wette, Credner, and others, all assign the first Ep. to Corinthians to Paul. Why? Because of the external evidence, and because there are many resemblances, after all, to the style and sentiments of Paul, scattered throughout the epistle. They are satisfied that Paul, in treating of subjects diverse from those which are discussed in his other epistles, must have had occasion for different words and different modes of expression. They allow this liberty. If now they do this, and if they justly allow it; and allow it in respect to a mere *prosaic* epistle, called forth by the exigencies of the church to whom it is addressed, and thus resembling in its occasion the other epistles of Paul; how can they refuse to *prophetic poetry*, modelled closely after that of the Hebrews, the like liberty of discrepancy from other prosaic compositions, as to diction and phraseology, and as to the circle of ideas and subjects introduced to the reader's consideration? *A fortiori* such a liberty of differing from prosaic composition must be conceded to the writer of such a book. I would ask for no more than any man, who has well studied the subject in regard to the first Ep. to Corinthians, will feel bound to concede, in order to maintain the genuineness of that epistle.

We may safely and readily admit, that there are some, or (if it be insisted on) *many* discrepancies of diction and phraseology, and differences as to doctrines developed, between the Apocalypse and the two books of John. Yet how all this is to prove that John did not write

the Apocalypse, I do not see. Is it so, that Luke did not write the Acts of the Apostles, because there are so many words and phrases in it, which are not in his Gospel? And specially, because in Acts the development of doctrines, both in respect to manner and matter, differs so much from that in the Gospel? Such reasoning, then, proves too much. It leaves us no safe harbour or place in which we may anchor our ship. We must put out to sea, and be contented to be forever tossing there, without coming to anchoring ground or to a harbour.

But I shall be asked: 'Whether there is not such a thing, after all, as discrepancy of diction and style, which is so great as to be decisive against sameness of authorship?' Undoubtedly there is. And yet, there are many cases of this nature, where a cautious man will be slow to decide on such a ground. Who does not know, as has already been intimated, the contradictory and confident judgments that have been proclaimed respecting the book of Deuteronomy; the prologue and epilogue of Job and the speeches of Elihu; many of the Psalms; almost one half of Isaiah; the larger portion of Zechariah; the first two chapters of Matthew; the 21st chapter of John; the epistle to the Ephesians; the pastoral epistles of Paul; the epistle to the Hebrews, and many other parts of the sacred books? Did not Wolf persuade half of Europe, a few years since, that many parts of the Iliad were spurious, and came from hands much later than Homer's? There is no end of this, and the like. Any author of talent, who has any variety in his thoughts, diction, and phraseology, always exposes himself to a charge of the like kind. And there are charges enough before the world, which are of such a nature as should teach us great caution and wariness in respect to deciding upon such grounds. It is not, it cannot be, an easy thing to determine how much a writer may differ from his former self, when he takes up a new theme, and is himself placed in circumstances that are altogether peculiar. Writers of some eminence in criticism could be easily named, who have distinguished, for example, the first chapter of Isaiah into three different compositions, and seem even to doubt whether they are to be attributed to the same author. And so of many other compositions in the Old Testament and in the New. Vogel, for example, assigns different portions of the Apocalypse to different authors. In particular, he finds such a diversity from the rest of the book in the epistles to the seven churches, that he cannot imagine they came from the same hand as the remainder of the Apocalypse. Bleek assigns chap. xii—xxi. to a period different from that of the preceding part of the book. But Schott and Ewald and Lücke all regard such views as destitute of any probability. How now can the subjective feelings and taste of different men constitute a standard on which we can rely? It does not follow, indeed, that there is no true taste, because

there is so often a false one; no true judgment and criticism, because haste and rashness so often usurp their place. But it does follow, that, taught by examples of this kind almost without number, we should proceed slowly and moderately and cautiously in such matters; specially when we are in opposition to all historical and traditionary evidence. Who does not know, that the book of Ecclesiastes, for example, has not only been assigned to some author much later than Solomon, but that it has been set down by many deep into Rabbinic times, on the alleged ground of its *Chaldeo-Rabbinic* style. Yet very recently Herzfeld has shown, that only some half a dozen words in it have any claim to be so ranked; and even some of these have a doubtful claim of this nature. That Solomon wrote it, is not indeed probable, on many grounds. Yet the diction and phraseology are much less decisive of this, than has been supposed by many for these some sixty or seventy years. The simple truth is, that first impressions on such subjects are not to be much relied upon. It needs a wide acquaintance with diction and phraseology, with the circle of common language and what is peculiar to this or that author, to decide with any just claim to credence and respect. Many and many a judgment of this kind is passed, without the patient and careful and protracted examination which is requisite. How can we trust to such decisions?

I allow with all readiness, that no one can read through the Gospel and Epistle of John continuously, and then read the Apocalypse, without a distinct and somewhat strong feeling of discrepance between the manner of these books. The Apocalypse introduces him into a world entirely new. Vision and symbol and trope and supernatural agents are everywhere to be seen, and little else besides them can be found. This difference of position, and of theme, and of object, is not at first fully appreciated. We refer the striking discrepancy rather to the manner of the writer himself than to his theme. By degrees, however, we may begin to bring this into the account. We perceive the Hebrew idiom everywhere—the close following in the steps of Daniel, and Ezekiel, and Zechariah. We begin, at least we should begin, to make all due allowance for this. Finally we come to passages and expressions which will, here and there, compare well with John's Gospel or Epistle. We even find some very striking resemblances, such as the *μαρτυρία*, the *ἄμνος*, and others. We find that the *discrepancies*, on further examination, have been greatly magnified; that they have been pushed to an excess, which, if we might argue in the same way, would destroy the evidence of genuineness as to any one of Paul's epistles. We find the writer cooped up, by such rules of criticism, into bounds so narrow, that differences in the modes of expression or diction, in relation to the same subjects, are not allowed him. He is constrained to tread the same

rounds—to grind in the same mill the same grain, and always to produce the same identical quality of flour. Such is the result of arguing confidently in the way that many have lately done, from internal evidence of diction and of style, against the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse.

And now, once more: *What says critical conscience and judgment?*

I cannot speak for others. Mine says, that the arguments from similitude of diction, phraseology, and thought, in the Apocalypse, all due allowances being made for the very different nature of the composition, go as far, or nearly as far, toward rendering *sameness* of authorship probable, as the arguments of the like nature from the discrepancies go to show a diversity of authorship. I do not say that the latter are not more numerous, if we take them as they have been adduced and relied upon. But have we not seen, in the course of the preceding examination, how many of them are without any solid basis? I repeat it, that no epistle of Paul can stand such a process. Why then should we rely upon it with so much confidence here?

But allowing that there is an apparent balance in favour of *diversity* of authorship, so far as diction and style are concerned; is it not, at all events, a small balance? Is not the simplicity of the construction of sentences throughout the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, a striking evidence in favour of the probability of the same authorship? It will not be seriously contended, that all the great features of Christian doctrine are not the same in both books. Nor will the possibility, that John may have been evangelist, a writer of epistles, and a prophet or poet, be called in question by reasonable men. The particular affection which Jesus manifested toward him, is evidence that he possessed striking qualities; and he may, therefore, have been called to act in different and important offices.

In a word; I deem the internal evidence, on which so much reliance is placed, as of quite too dubious a nature to be entitled to full confidence. Considered in and by itself, and without any reference to the historical testimony, I should regard it as undecisive; although my mind might be perplexed by it. But when we take into the account, what is really matter of fact, that in all antiquity there is not a trace of any reliable *historical* testimony against the Johannean origin of the Apocalypse; how are we to set aside all this, the best and surest kind of evidence, and decide against the apostolic origin merely on the ground of a supposed balance in favour of such a decision, from the internal evidence of diction and phraseology and course of thought? I cannot so decide, without giving up the Pauline origin of 1 Ep. to the Corinthians. There is a number of books in the New Testament canon, which have less decisive evidence in their favour than the Apocalypse. There are few indeed that have more or even as much *historical* evidence. Let

us be consistent. We must either accede to the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, or show good reason why we do not. The alleged discrepancies of style, etc., do not, on the whole, seem to me to amount to such a reason.

With all the evidence that is before me from history, and all from diction, style, and course of thought, I feel compelled to believe, that THE BALANCE IS DECIDEDLY IN FAVOUR OF AN APOSTOLIC ORIGIN.

§ 24. *Brief examination of other views respecting authorship.*

We have seen that the Alogi, in the second century, and probably Caius, attributed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. But to say nothing of the religious views of Cerinthus, so entirely at variance with much that is in the Apocalypse, there is not the remotest probability that the churches of Asia, omitting the mention of others, would have received a book from Cerinthus, and consented to regard it as the work of John the apostle. One may say what he pleases about the number of apocryphal books in the early periods of the church, and the facility with which a few of them found admission to some of the churches, yet the state of the New Testament canon shows, that reasoning founded on such allegations cannot have much force in the case before us. Where is the book in the New Testament, that was not deemed *apostolical*, either directly or indirectly? By *indirect* apostolical books, I mean such books as those of Mark and Luke. The authors of these were *apostolical men;* and so the ancients named them. Yet totally improbable as the allegation is, that Cerinthus wrote the Apocalypse, in recent times we find an Oeder, a Semler, a Stroth, a Merkel, a Corrodi, and others, admitting and defending it. But this mode of criticism has now gone by, and no further effort is needed in order to refute it. See pp. 336 seq, and 339 seq. above, respecting the Alogi and Caius.

Others, in recent times, because the author of the Apocalypse is, in many of the Mss., named *Θεόλογος* in the inscription to the book, have made the supposition, that the John who wrote the book, was some person otherwise unknown to us, but who, by his title, is distinguished from John the apostle. But this title is of suspicious authority, and at all events originated in the church long after the Apocalypse was written; and when applied to the author of the Apocalypse, it was meant merely to designate John as proposing and vindicating the doctrine of the *Θεὸς λόγος*. Ballenstedt, the author of the supposition before us, never made, so far as I can learn, any converts of eminence to his opinion.

Others, in ancient and modern times, have assigned the Apocalypse to *John the presbyter* at Ephesus; who is mentioned by Papias, as one from whom he obtained material for his Exegesis. Dionysius of Alex-

andria conjectured that this John might have written the Apocalypse, but he did not affirm it. Eusebius, in his perplexity about the author of the book, suggests the same idea; Bleek, De Wette, Paulus, Credner and others, have leaned the same way. (See in Cred. Einleit. p. 733). But this has already been amply discussed in § 17; and no repetition of such a discussion is here needed. The more I reflect on this opinion, the more improbable and uncertain it seems to be. Lücke and Schott have not ventured to adopt it.

It is a matter of some interest to inquire, what these last named and more sober men, as well as much better informed in matters pertaining to the Apocalypse, have thought and said in respect to the *authorship* of the book. Schott (p. 484 Isag.) has given us his view in a few words. In substance it is as follows: 'John, while at Patmos, had visions of such a nature as the Apocalypse relates. These he afterwards wrote down, *for his own use*, in the Aramaean-Hebrew of the times. Some one of the disciples and friends of John, being permitted to read this record, translated it into Greek, making such additions to it, and such arrangements of its contents, as gave the book its present artificial shape. At the same time, the new editor expanded many of the thoughts and descriptions, so as to please his own judgment or fancy. The book thus constituted, was substantially John's; but the *form* and *manner* and *diction* often differed from those of John, as exhibited in his Greek works. In this way we may account both for the *discrepancies* between the Apocalypse and John, and also for the *similitudes*. The latter are truly Johannean; and the former owe their peculiarities to the Greek editor of the work.'

Thus Schott, with all the gravity becoming the occasion. And now the *proof?* Not a trace of such an opinion can be found on record. No ancient critic ever dreamed of such an origin of the book. Not a hint can be found that the Apocalypse ever was written in *Hebrew*. The internal evidence is strongly against it. The whole then is mere *conjecture*. Can this guide us in a matter like the present?

'But,' says Schott, 'the internal evidence is so against John the evangelist as author, that almost any supposition is as probable as this; and the one in question is not an unnatural one, while it seemingly reconciles all the discrepancies that now exist. Why is not a supposition, which brings about harmony among so many discords, altogether probable and worthy of reception?'

My answer would be, that it reconciles only a small part of the discords. How does it reconcile the *historic* testimony in favour of the apostle John, which is so uniform during the first three centuries, and which must be more worthy of reliance than any other, although the possibility of mistake be admitted? And the *discords*—are not a great proportion

of them dependent merely on the mode of reasoning from diction and style? And has not this mode plainly admitted and adopted much that is inconclusive and unsatisfactory? How then can we receive and admit a most important conclusion in criticism, without other evidence than that which rests on such a basis? More might easily be said; but I reserve it for the sequel, in which Lücke's similar hypothesis will come before us for examination.

Lücke presents the subject in a manner circumstantially different. He does not suppose John to have committed anything of his visions to writing. But 'John related them, on his return from Patmos, to some of the Asiatic churches; as Paul told of his to the Corinthians, 2 Cor. xi. Some intelligent friend and disciple of John reduced this narration to writing, preserving in many cases the Johannean style and manner, and in other cases employing his own. Hence the diversity and resemblances. Both are accounted for on such a ground.'

Candidly he says, at the close of his exposition: "To be sure this is only a hypothesis, for the support of which all traces of historical testimony are wanting;" p. 391. But he goes on to say in its defence, that it reconciles all the contradictory phenomena of the book. Then, in the next place, we have other apocryphal works of the early times, which were composed in a like way, i. e. by prefixing apostolic names to them. He suggests that no one has yet shown, that the book of Daniel and 2 Peter do not belong to the same category. He tells us, that the early Christians thought much more of the *subject-matter* of a book, than they did about the *author*. The Apocalypse appeared to be from an authentic source; it addressed itself originally to the exigencies of the times; and it came into favour in these circumstances, without any definite critical inquiries.

But why then — if books were so easily admitted into the Canon of the New Testament — why were not the book of Enoch, the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, the fourth of Ezra, the Epistle of Clement of Rome, and other early books of a similar kind, admitted into the Canon? If the answer be, that some did admit them, yet the reply is at hand. By the great mass of Christians in the church catholic, they were not admitted. They were sometimes read for edification; but not as proper Scripture. The New Testament, in regard to this matter, speaks for itself. It speaks not less by its narrow limits as to the number of authors, than it does by the matter which it contains. Where are the conceits, the superstitions, the silly narrations, the puerilities of the apocryphal books, to be found in the New Testament? The difference between the two classes is exceedingly great. It has often seemed to me, while reading the apocryphal books, that they bear on their very face the stamp of condemnation. I can hardly imagine a more effect-

ual way of convincing one's self of the marked superiority of the New Testament, than to read and diligently compare with it the early apocryphal books. What was it, now, that occasioned a difference so striking? And how came the churches to fix upon the canonical books, and to dismiss the others from all competition with them? I can perceive only one way of answering these questions. Tertullian and Irenaeus have indeed so often answered them, and brought out to view the principles of the early church as to canonical books, that any other answer is unnecessary.

But there are other difficulties in the way of admitting Lücke's hypothesis; difficulties to which he has indeed adverted (p. 393 seq.), but which he has not satisfactorily removed. We have seen that the Apocalypse must in all probability have been composed about A. D. 68, i. e. some thirty years before the death of the apostle John. We know, also, that the churches in Asia Minor, addressed in the Apocalypse, were within the circle of John's evangelical labours. We can have no reasonable doubt, that the Apocalypse was first published and read by the churches to whom it was addressed. The epistles and book itself purport to be from the pen of a John in banishment at Patmos—from a John who had the care and supervision of the churches addressed by him. It is impossible that the alleged writer of the book should not have been well known to the Asiatic churches of that time. If the Apocalypse was published among them either before or after the return from exile in Patmos, in either case, when John had returned and resumed his usual active labours among these same churches, could anything have been easier than for them to inquire and ascertain, whether the book addressed and commended to them was really apostolic or not? It was instinctive to make such inquiries. The churches were solemnly addressed, warned, reproved, and commanded; the book was commended to their perusal, by the promise of blessings to the diligent and careful reader, and the threat of curses to the negligent one, and to every one who should venture to tamper with its contents. How could the churches do less than inquire, whether there was any good foundation for all this, and what their obligations in reality were in respect to the book? Inquiry in this case must terminate in certain knowledge. There was no room for conjectural opinion.

Have we then one word, from any of these churches, of doubt respecting the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse? Not one. Papias, near the close of the first century, had plainly read the book, and made it the basis of his millennial opinions. Andreas and Arethas assure us, that Papias regarded it as the work of John; and the very use he made of it serves to confirm this. Papias was indeed a great lover of anecdote, and had a taste for the marvellous. But the extracts which Eu-

sebius has given us from his Ἐξηγήσεις show, that he was aware of the pains necessary to distinguish true from false reports. Eusebius himself, although he avers that Papias is σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν as to his millennial credulity, calls him "λογιώτατος and well skilled in the Scriptures." It is not to be supposed that the bishop of Hierapolis, who was within the circle of John's supervision, had a different opinion about the author of the Apocalypse from that of the churches addressed. Such a supposition would be utterly improbable. In a word; the churches addressed in the manner of the Apocalypse, and having opportunity to know by what authority, must have inquired and known who it was that addressed them. Report — tradition — from them downwards through all the early ages, has assigned the Apocalypse to the apostle John.

Then, if we even put this construction aside, how are we to account for it, that any man within the circle of John's official duties, should venture to assume his name and use his authority? If the book was honestly written by another John, why has he not told us who he was, so as to be distinguished from the great apostle? If another John were the author, how could such a tradition spring up among the very churches addressed, and be perpetuated, that John the evangelist wrote the Apocalypse? If he did not—how could any other man be rash enough to suppose that he could escape detection? If John the apostle neither wrote the book, nor procured another to write it, could any other person believe that he himself had authority sufficient among the Asiatic churches, to induce them to receive the book as authoritative, while it was known to be factitious? And then as to the apostle John—could it be that he would suffer an imposition of this kind to be practised upon the churches under his care, when it was in his power at any moment to expose it? If we say, as some have done: 'The leading thoughts and visions were substantially his, because he had entertained them; and what was superadded was not inconsistent with his views and feelings, and so he let it pass in silence;' this argument is spoiled by the question: Is this the way of openness and sincerity and integrity? Why should John encourage others to act a concealed and borrowed part, in so important a matter? Why did not John, if he meant to publish by another hand, himself superintend the performance, and thus sanction the whole? How could it be expected that a fictitious book, of such high claims, and whose contents were professedly so important, would gain currency in a region where it was perfectly easy to learn its genetic history? I do not say that such things as Lücke supposes to have taken place, were impossible; but how can I say less, than that they are altogether *improbable?*

Lücke has suggested, that if it could only be shown that the Apoca-

lypse was written *after* the death of John, then the whole hypothesis which he has proposed could be easily maintained. In this way he thinks that John xxi. was added, after the death of the Evangelist. But we need not discuss this; for Lücke has no doubt that the Apocalypse was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. So, if the Apocalypse came from another hand than that of the apostle, it must have been some thirty years before his death, during which period all the churches of that region might at any time know who wrote the book, and to what authority it was entitled. Nothing can be more certain, than that the holy earnestness and sincerity everywhere developed in the book, are real and not assumed. I cannot conceive of a fictitious writer of that day, who could preserve such a tone and manner throughout. Nor can I imagine how the dishonesty of employing the apostle's credit to sanction and render current his work, could have been approved by John, or passed by in silence. The whole matter is attended with too many improbabilities to have claim on our confidence. The problem — if it even be such — that John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, with all its difficulties about diction and phraseology, is quite easy and simple to my mind, in comparison with such a problem as that of Schott and Lücke.

§ 25. *Unity of the book; different Opinions examined.*

Grotius, so far as I can ascertain, was the first to suggest that the Apocalypse is a series of visions, written successively, and at periods somewhat distant from each other. He grounds this opinion on the different accounts we have, in ancient times, of the period of John's exile, viz., under Claudius, Nero, and Domitian; and also the different places at which it is said to have been written, viz., Patmos and Ephesus. He assumes the equal credibility of these accounts, and supposes, in order to reconcile all difficulties, that all of them are true, and that John, at different times in exile, may have written some portions of the Apocalypse at each time, or soon after; and that some of it may have been written at Patmos, and some at Ephesus. All this seems to him to be confirmed by the internal divisions of the Apocalypse, e. g. 1: 9. 4: 1. 14: 1, etc. The first eleven chapters, he thinks, must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. The last part, specially from chap. xv. onward, must have been written at the time of Vespasian, and Titus, and Domitian. To make out this, he begins the list of the seven kings, mentioned in Rev. 17: 10, with Claudius, because this, according to Epiphanius, is the first date of John's exile. He divides the whole book into some *ten* different compositions.

That the Apocalypse was all written in one day, or at a single sitting,

no one will reasonably suppose. But that the book is a mere collection of different visions, written at periods widely separated from each other, cannot well be credited by any one who examines the unity of its plan, and the mutual correspondence of its respective parts. Above all, if the idea of *trichotomy* in it be admitted, (see § 7 above), the hypothesis of Grotius is entirely inadmissible. The general *unity* of the book is an indispensable ingredient.

Various as the reports of antiquity are about the time and place of writing the Apocalypse, yet no ancient writer has given a hint that the book was composed at different times. And as to the book itself, there are indeed many transitions in it, in turning from the consideration of one object to another. The most remarkable is at the close of chap. xi. Yet the book gives no intimation of anything more than a mere succession of visions, a succession being necessary to the distinctness of each; it intimates nothing of long intervals of time between them. It is enough to say, that the nature of the plan requires sequency or succession of revelations; but there is nothing in the book which might not have been written as well in A. D. 68, and within a short period, as afterwards. Grotius' manner of reckoning the kings or emperors is wholly gratuitous, and indeed unnatural. There must be some obvious starting point for such a reckoning; and what so obvious as that of the first emperor? The hypothesis of Grotius does not, indeed, call in question the *unity of authorship*, but only the unity of time as to the composition, and, almost of course, the unity of general design in the book. Few, however, have adopted the hypothesis in question; and in the present state of criticism in respect to the book, still fewer will be disposed to adopt it. There is nothing in the Apocalypse which urges upon us the belief that it is miscellaneous. The book is of a stamp so uniform throughout, as would seem to forbid the admission of such a view. Compositions of different periods, and on different occasions, could not be made so to chime together as do those of the Apocalypse. This will be further illustrated in the sequel.

Vogel, in his VII. Commentationes Apocalypticae, has gone beyond Grotius. He not only supposes that the Apocalypse was written at different periods, but by different persons. That portion of the Apocalypse included in 1: 9—3: 22, i. e. the seven epistles, he thinks was written some years after chap. iv—xi, and probably by the same hand, although he affirms the style of the epistles to be purer Greek. John the apostle, he supposes, may have written these parts of the book, while Rev. 1: 1—8 and xii—xxii. were written at a later period and by another person, i. e. by John the presbyter.

All these suppositions are built on alleged intervals of time between the writing of different parts of the book, and on the assumed discrep-

ancies of style. I shall merely glance at some of the leading allegations.

'Chap. iv—xi. must have been written before the persecution of Nero, for no allusion is made in it to *heathen* persecutions.'—But conceding this last assertion, it would only be conceding that the author, who first follows out the *Jewish* persecution (iv—xi.), and then the heathen one (xii—xix.), has not intermingled them. Why should he? Yet if any one will read carefully chaps. vi. vii, he will find more than one implication, that persecution exists out of Judea as well as in it. Vogel thinks that the author of Rev. iv—xi. must be a different person from the author of xii—xxii, because the former gives no intimation of Christ's future earthly kingdom. If he means by this, a *visible* terrestrial reign of Christ on earth, as I presume he does, I find this disclosed as little in the second part of the Apocalypse as in the first. All depends on Vogel's exegesis. But apart from this; why should the author of the Apocalypse mention or allude to everything in the first part of his book, which he has brought forward in the last part? Will any one demand, that he should merely repeat in the second part what he has said in the first? But more than all, is there not in Rev. 11: 15 an express recognition of Christ's kingdom and reign? Yea, a recognition of the same kind of kingdom and reign which chap. xx. describes? And does not chap. 5: 10 make a reference to the same kingdom—one which is not to be mistaken? And does not Rev. 11: 17, 18, exhibit the same sentiment? Nothing can be more unfounded than this objection of Vogel. The kingdom to be set up is so evidently the same throughout the book, that this very circumstance is one of the arguments in favour of its unity.

When Vogel, in order to carry his point, suggests, that there is a great difference of style between chap. iv—xi. and the remainder of the book; that the former exhibits a truly poetical spirit, while the latter shows great indigence and even poverty of thought; that the former exhibits appropriate order and congruity, while the latter brings to view much that is inappropriate, makes useless repetitions, and presents imagery revolting to the taste; it is quite plain, that all this depends on his subjective feelings and taste. Where, in the second part of the Apocalypse, is there anything that approaches so near the incredible and the monstrous, as the locusts and the horsemen in chap. ix. of the first part? As to the rest, it seems quite plain to me, that there is, in the latter part, an advance upon the variety of expression and imagery in the first part. Conformity to the author's general plan has, indeed, occasioned some considerable resemblance between the description of the events that follow the sounding of the trumpets (viii.), and of those that succeed the pouring out of the vials (xvi.). But in many other respects

there is a great variety of representation; see xiv. xvii. xviii. xix. Even Vogel himself is obliged to confess, that he cannot point out any striking differences between the style of the two main parts of the Apocalypse. And in fact one may well say, that if there ever was evidence of one and the same hand, which might be gathered from the tone and manner of different parts of any composition, that evidence is strikingly exhibited here. A difference of objects presented to the mind, and the completion of a regular plan, must of course bring new and varying subjects before the writer's mind; and this seems to be all on which there is any room to build the alleged discrepancies. But this is a basis quite too narrow to sustain them. How easy it would be to prove that the Epistle to the Romans, or the first Epistle to the Corinthians, was written by different persons—how easy, I mean, on just such grounds as Vogel assumes—every one who reads them critically must see.

In order to confirm his view, Vogel appeals to the alleged fact, that the last part of the Apocalypse often *imitates* chap. iv—xi.; and this imitation he makes out from the plain and frequent connection between the two parts of the book, and the mutual allusions that exist. But how such a connection can prove a difference of authorship, one cannot well see. Could not the same author—would he not—connect the different parts of his work by allusions to what had preceded, and by assuming it, at proper times, as the basis of further remark, or the subject of further explication? And this is the amount of all that John has done. In developing the progress of the final plagues, under the seven trumpets and under the seven vials, he moves in a similar circle in many respects, and yet is circumstantially diverse. I cannot discern any of the affectation of an imitator, in the latter part of the book. On the contrary, it seems plain to me, that the freedom of thought and expression is even more ample and complete than in the former part.

In a word, nearly the whole of Vogel's objections to the unity of the Apocalypse rests upon his exegesis and his subjective taste and judgment about style. I cannot resist the impression, that in neither of these respects is he a safe model, or entitled to much distinction. His Dissertations, which were seven years in a course of composition and publication, have not attracted much notice; and they bid fair to be soon forgotten. Bleek, in his Dissertation on the Apocalypse (Theol. Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher, etc.), and Lücke (Einleit. p. 429 seq.), have minutely examined the particulars of Vogel's arguments, and shown them to be without force. It is unnecessary to be minute here. The positive argument in favour of *unity* will be presented in the sequel; and if this is well founded, such objections fall to the ground of course.

Bleek (Diss. above referred to) after all his criticism on Vogel, has assumed ground which seems not to be any more inviting than that of the

author whom he has examined. He assumes, in the first place, that Rev. 17: 10 points to Vespasian as the then reigning emperor; and of course that chaps. xii—xxii. were written *after* the destruction of Jerusalem. Chap. iv—xi., he maintains at the same time, were written *before* the destruction of that city. Of course, although he attributes both parts of the book to the same author, yet he supposes a considerable interval of time to elapse between the writing of the two parts.

But all this depends entirely on his exegesis of Rev. 17: 10. In order to make out that Vespasian is the reigning emperor at that time, he omits Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, in his list of emperors. I must refer the reader to the Commentary and Excursus on this passage, for confutation of this exegesis. Lücke has also confuted it sufficiently, Einleit. p. 252 seq.

But Bleek has ventured to take a bolder step. He calls our attention to the striking transition at the end of chap. xi.—a transition to a state of things entirely new. Hitherto Christ in his glorified state only had been exhibited; but now the writer goes back and begins with his nativity, the persecution of him, and his ascension to glory. There must have been some strong reason for such a *regressive* step. And what was it? Bleek answers this question in a way that one would scarcely expect. He suggests that the writer composed iv—xi. antecedently to the destruction of Jerusalem; that the seventh and last trumpet, as it was at first and originally described, was followed by the coming of Christ and the complete establishment of his kingdom. With such a description this first portion of the present book, as he thinks, originally ended. But time passed on; Jerusalem was destroyed, and the Jewish nation crushed; and still the kingdom of Christ did not come. The author, perceiving this, abscinded the closing part of chap. xi, which respected the coming and kingdom of Christ, and commenced *de novo* his second part with the *heathen* enemies of the church, whose destruction was yet future. So the last and larger part of the Apocalypse took its rise at a later period than the first; and it arose from the efforts to correct what had been a mistake in the original close of the first part.

In all this, however, there is so much of mere hypothesis, yea, so much of improbable hypothesis, that one is perplexed to know in what way he can most advantageously canvass the subject. Bleek has overlooked the substantial fact, that there are *three* catastrophes in the book; that the first series of events has a *proëm* (chap. iv. v.); that the second series, in conformity with this plan, has also a proëm (chap. xii.); while the third, which respects distant future events (chap. xx.), and is exceedingly brief, necessarily dispenses in the main with this. It is plain that the author designed to set forth to view, in the latter part of his book, the grounds of Satan's particular rage against Christians, and of

his efforts to excite bitter persecution among the heathen against them. In order to do this, he introduces a sketch of Satan's combats and defeats with and by the author of the new religion. What could be more apposite as a proëm, than matter of this kind? The author meant to set before the reader the grounds of the long protracted, bitter, and bloody war that was excited among the heathen against Christianity, which, with its progress and termination, constitutes the second catastrophe. By the proëm (chap. xii.), he has made the transition from the first to the second catastrophe very plain and palpable. He doubtless intended to do this. But to determine how he could do it successfully and with relevant matter, demanded the exercise of both taste and judgment. Has he done amiss? Is not chap. xii. a rapid and beautiful sketch of the first beginnings of the Christian religion? Is there no designed congruity between the exhibition of Satan here, and in the sequel of the discourse? As the beasts from the sea and from the land are both but instruments in the hands of Satan, and are influenced by his bitter malignity, why not exhibit the causes and special grounds of that malignity? And particularly so, since an exhibition of the protection vouchsafed to the woman "clothed with the sun," and to the man-child "who should rule the nations," was cheering and full of hope for all who were suffering from persecution.

I might object, that Bleek's supposition degrades the Apocalypse, and sets down its author in the rank of mere soothsayers. What less than this is it, to represent him as finding that he had made a prediction in language too definite, and which did not well correspond with actual events, and then as trying his hand a second time, and making sure to be sufficiently indefinite to escape detection, or at any rate putting off fulfilment so long that his credit could not suffer during his life time? I know not how to reconcile the tone, and tenor, and earnestness, and sincerity, and deep reverence for God and Christ and for all that is holy and pure, everywhere manifested in the Apocalypse, with such a part as Bleek supposes the author of this book to have acted. With my views of chap. iv. v. and xii, as mere proëms to the two leading parts of the book, I find no difficulty in the transition itself, or in the nature of it, at the beginning of chap. xii.

From these differing views about the time and manner in which the Apocalypse was originated, let us now turn to the consideration of the evidences of its UNITY. If these are satisfactory, they will be a sufficient answer to all the different hypotheses.

(1) Were I to follow the simple persuasion of my own mind, in presenting these evidences, I should rank, as first of all, *the characteristics of style and idiom; for these are in all respects substantially the same throughout the book.*

I am aware that the reply to this will be, that what I allege is a matter of taste and judgment, and not a simple matter of fact; and that if I cast myself upon these, I must of course permit others to judge for themselves on the same grounds. I know well that they have in fact done so, and have decided differently. But still I must appeal from this judgment; and I am ready to make the appeal to every unprejudiced man on earth, who has no favourite theory to maintain, and who is competent to make an appropriate investigation, whether there is any book in the Old Testament or the New, that is even so strongly marked with a style peculiar to itself, and uniform throughout, as the Apocalypse. Perhaps we might except the Gospel and Epistle of John. There is a *Hebraism* lying upon the face of the whole Apocalypse, a similarity (yet not a mere imitation) to the Old Testament prophets; a universal fulness of symbol and trope, even in communicating the most common ideas; a remarkable simplicity and strait-forwardness in the construction of sentences; a similar use of particles such as *καί*, etc., and a similar omission of certain ones usual elsewhere, such as *οὖν* and *δέ*; the like transitions in discourse by a *μετὰ ταῦτα* and a simple *καί*; a like omission of all exact notation of time when the visions took place; the same solemn, deep, earnest tone of discourse, whether in describing, or promising, or threatening; the same apparent consciousness of certainty as to all which is said, and the utterance of all with confidence that it cannot be gainsayed; the same claim of authority to speak with full assurance; the like vivid alternations of light and shade; the like rapid transitions, seemingly abrupt and without preparation—all these and more of the like kind, develope themselves in every part of the book. This is not opinion but fact—fact which no attentive and discerning reader will now venture to deny. But to all this must be added, (and it is an important part of the evidence in question), that there is a *sameness of idiom* throughout the book. I need not re-produce the evidence of this. The reader may find it fully exhibited in § 15 above, where the object is to produce and explain the characteristic idioms of the Apocalypse. As it is quite plain, that these idioms are scattered with a somewhat equal hand throughout the whole book, we may well ask: How can it be rationally supposed, that different writers would have agreed in these peculiarities, many of which are very minute, and escape any but the closest observation? To suppose this would be unnatural and improbable. We are not therefore at liberty to make such a supposition, unless some absolute necessity should compel us to do it. But who can show us any such necessity? If I may speak my own convictions in relation to the style of the Apocalypse, I should say, that I have never read a book, the style and idiom of which bear stronger marks of unity of authorship than those of the one in question.

But this, it will be said, is of avail only against such men as Vogel, who assume different authors; but not against the theories of Grotius and Bleek, who only suppose different periods of time, and those of some length, to have intervened between the different parts of the book. I concede that what has thus far been said, goes mainly to show *unity of authorship* only, not unity of time. But there are evidences of the latter, which seem to me so satisfactory that I know not how we can well withhold our assent.

(2) The different parts of the Apocalypse mutually refer to each other; and in such a way, and so often, that the natural conclusion is, that they are parts of one whole, originally designed as a whole, and executed in a manner correspondent with the design.

I begin with the Epistles to the churches, as connected with the other parts of the book. These are naturally the most distinct of any part; and if a foreign hand is disclosed by any portion of the book, it might naturally be sought here. The part which apparently commences this portion of the Apocalypse, is chap. 1: 9; the end of it is 3: 22. While most of the introductory sentences in each epistle have a direct reference to the description of Christ in 1: 11—16, thus plainly connecting with the epistles the paragraph in 1: 9—20, yet there is one epistle which plainly refers to 1: 5 in the general introduction; see and comp. 3: 14. I should add to this, the reference in 3: 1 to the *seven spirits* which are mentioned in 1: 4. The proleptic references in the epistles to the main body of the book, (for we must regard them as proleptic or anticipative if we begin the comparison with the epistles), are numerous; e. g. the second death, 2: 11, comp. 20: 14. 21: 8; the sharp sword from the Saviour's mouth, 2: 16, comp. 19: 15, 21; the new name understood only by the Saviour, 2: 17. 3: 12, comp. 19: 12; reward according to works, 2: 23, comp. 20: 12, 13; the king Messiah ruling with a rod of iron, 2: 27, comp. 12: 5. 19: 15; the morning star, 2: 28, comp. 22: 16; coming as a thief, 3: 3, comp. 16: 15; white robes of the saints, 3: 4, 18, comp. 4: 4. 6: 11. 7: 9, 13; book of life, 3: 5, comp. 20: 12. 21: 27; I come quickly, 3: 11, comp. 1: 3. 22: 7, 12.

It will be a more easy and obvious way of making this comparison, if the reader should reverse the order of the references; and then, supposing the epistles to have been written before chaps. iv—xxii, consider the mutual relations and parallelisms as arising from a reference to the epistles made subsequently, and when the writer was in the progress of composing the work. The great point aimed at is, to show that the relations and dependencies of one part on another are so numerous, as to imply a *unity* of plan and execution.

Let us proceed from the epistles to the seven churches, to the second great division of the Apocalypse, viz. chap. iv—xi. Does this stand intimately connected with the preceding and following parts of the book?

The very outset necessarily involves connection with a preceding part, viz. *μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον κ. τ. λ.*, *after this* or *after these things*. And what are the things? Surely those which the preceding vision and context embraces, viz. 1: 9—3: 22. So it would seem altogether probable, that the *epistolary* part of the Apocalypse was actually written first. At any rate, the writer had the design that it should appear to have been so written. But further. *The first voice* mentioned in 4: 1 refers plainly to 1: 10. Ib. the *things that must be hereafter* must be referred to 1: 19. In 4: 2, *I was in the Spirit*, comp. 1: 10. 21: 10; out of the throne were lightnings, thunderings, and voices, 4: 5. 8: 5, comp. 16: 18; seven spirits of God, 4: 5. 5: 6, comp. 1: 4; sea of glass before the throne, 4: 6, comp. 15: 2; which was, and is, and is to come, 4: 8, comp. 1: 4; he who liveth forever and ever, 4: 9. 5: 14, comp. 1: 18; the *ῥίζα*, *root-shoot* of David, 5: 5, comp. 22: 16; sung a new song, 5: 9, comp. 14: 3; every kindred and tongue and people and nation, 6: 9. 7: 9. 11: 9, comp. 14: 6; made us kings and priests to God, 5: 6, comp. 20: 6; in 19: 4, the four beasts and twenty-four elders plainly refer to 4: 4, 6. 5: 14; the conqueror on a white horse, 6: 2, comp. 19: 11; the crown on the head of the conqueror, 6: 2, comp. 14: 14; those who are slain for the word of God and the testimony which they held fast, 6: 9, comp. 20: 4. 19: 10; a great earthquake after opening the sixth seal, 6: 12, the like after the seventh trumpet, 16: 18; every island and mountain moved from its place, 6: 14, comp. 16: 20; the great day of wrath, 6: 17, and (which is equivalent) the great day of God Almighty, 16: 14; God shall dwell among his people, 7: 15, comp. 21: 4; God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, 7: 17, comp. 21: 4; the sea turned into blood, 8: 8, comp. 16: 3; the star falls on the rivers and fountains, 8: 10, comp. 16: 3, where the vial is poured on the same; the bottomless pit as the habitation of all that is noisome and destructive, 9: 2 seq., comp. 17: 8; the angels of destruction at the river Euphrates, 9: 14, comp. 16: 12; sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, 9: 21, comp. 22: 15; who made heaven and earth and the sea, 10: 6, comp. 14: 7; time no longer, after sounding the seventh trumpet, 10: 6, comp. 16: 17, where is the same as to seventh vial; forty and two months, 11: 2, 3, comp. 12: 6, 14. 13: 5; the beast from the bottomless pit, 11: 7, comp. 17: 8, and also 13: 1, 11, where in each case the beast comes from the abyss below; the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of God and Christ, 11: 15, comp. 12: 10; small and great that fear his name, 11: 18, comp. 19: 5; the temple of God in heaven opened, 11: 19, comp. 15: 5, 8; great hail, 11: 19, comp. 16: 21.

Such is the obvious connection, as to phraseology and mode of representation, of chap. iv—xi. with the other parts of the Apocalypse. I need only to add a few cases more from chap. xii—xxii. of reference to

the *first* part of the Apocalypse; which were not included in the comparison of that part with the rest of the book, as made on p. 434 above. Such are the following: The voice of many waters, 14: 2. 19: 6, comp. 1: 15; appearance of Jesus like to the Son of man, 12: 14, comp. 1: 13; the seven angels, 15: 7, comp. 1: 4; which art, and wast, and shall be, 16: 5, comp. 1: 4, 8; coming as a thief—walking naked, 16: 15, comp. 3: 4, 18; eyes like a flame of fire, 19: 12, comp. 1: 14. 2: 18; holy city coming down from God, 21: 2, comp. 3: 12; *ἐν πνεύματι*, 21: 10. 17: 3, comp. 1: 10; the tree of life, 22: 2, comp. 2: 7; name written upon the saints, 22: 4. 14: 1, comp. 3: 12; I am Alpha and Omega, 21: 6. 22: 13, comp. 1: 8, 11.

I am aware that this list might be easily augmented. But I do not wish to urge all the minutiae of resemblances. The similarity is ample, as now exhibited. And although I am apprehensive that it may be objected to some of the examples, that they are merely the common property of sacred language and imagery, and so might be used by any writer who was of a religious cast of mind; yet, in nearly all the cases presented, there is either a peculiarity in the *modus* of the representation, or in the connection in which it stands, that makes a resemblance too plain to be denied between the different parts of the Apocalypse. What can we say to such cases as the Alpha and Omega, is and was and is to come, tree of life, and many others peculiar to the Apocalypse, and found in all parts of it? The same mind must have produced a composition so entirely of the like tenor, idiom, and peculiarities throughout.

I know it may be said, that some friend of John, who greatly approved of his style, imitated him as closely as he could, and did this of set purpose; and so it comes about, as Vogel assumes, that the last part of the Apocalypse bears so strong a general resemblance to the preceding parts. But I cannot assume the fact of mere imitation, in this case, without some proof, or without some good degree of probability. There is no urgent reason from any quarter, why we should admit a variety of authorship; and the regular gradation and development of the book show that the whole was composed in consequence of a plan, and in conformity with it. I can never persuade myself, that a book of such extraordinary earnestness and sincerity as the Apocalypse could have been written by a mere imitator, who aimed at imposing on the world by coming forward in the name of another.

But I must go one step further. If the structure of the Apocalypse, as developed in § 7 above, is well founded and matter of fact, and *trichotomy* or *triplicity* pervades the plan of the book in general, and then of all its subordinate parts, then is it absolutely certain that the book is from one and the same mind and hand. The *unity* of the general plan

is perfectly consistent with the *triplicity* of the parts; while the *complete* triplicity, on the other hand, becomes essential to the general unity. Who could deem it possible, that another hand, different from that of the original author, should interfere and carry out a plan so artificial and so nicely adjusted in all its relative parts? The thing is out of all question.

We may reasonably settle down in the conclusion, then, that whoever wrote the leading part of the book, viz. chapters iv—xi., must have written the other parts. Whether John the apostle, or the presbyter, or the theologue (if we may reckon him a distinct person), wrote the book, the same mind and hand must have executed the whole. No one in all antiquity ever suspected that the book belonged to different authors. Nor was there, nor is there, any good reason to suspect it.

Nor can we deem the supposition much more probable, that long intervals of time took place between the composition of the different parts of the book, admitting that it is all the work of one and the same man. The plan is too much connected, interwoven, dove-tailed together (if I may so speak), and the impressions and phrases and idioms, in all the different parts of the book, bear too striking a resemblance to each other, to permit its being rendered probable, that the author suspended his work, during the execution of it, beyond the short periods of intermission that are necessary in the composition of every work of any considerable magnitude. The same general state — the same fervid glow — of mind and imagination is plainly exhibited in all parts of the Apocalypse.

§ 26. *Canonical rank and credit of the Apocalypse.*

It is a matter of course, that all who have attributed the Apocalypse to the apostle John, have ranked it among those books which are of the highest authority, or, in other words, have placed it on a level, as to its authority, with the Gospels and Epistles in general of the New Testament. Such as have come to the conviction which the writer of these sheets has expressed and assayed to defend in the preceding pages, can have no hesitation to admit the Apocalypse among the *authentic* records of the New Dispensation. Such as doubt respecting the genuineness or the apostolic origin of the book, will of course assign to it a lower place. But there may be a variety of opinion and feeling among such persons, in regard to the proper place of this book. Those in ancient and in modern times who have assailed the book with contumely and contempt, e. g. the Alogi and perhaps Caius anciently, and Oeder, Corrodi, and others like them recently, have of course ranked the Revelation among the mere figments of apocryphal productions, and regarded it as worthy of no credit. But there has been, even from

early times, and still is, a class of men who have doubts about the real Johannean origin of the Apocalypse, and yet have not ventured to cast the book out of the canon, but have been inclined to regard it as a kind of deutero-canonical book; to which one might appeal, however, with entire confidence, only when he found it in accordance with the other books of the New Testament. It is the object of the present section, to give some brief historic notices of the canonical credit attached to the Apocalypse, which have not already been included in the view that has been taken of the state of opinion among the ancients or moderns, and also to make some suggestions relative to the subject of the *canonicity* of the book, which could not well be introduced into the preceding historical investigations.

Lücke (p. 449 seq.) remarks, that we have no very definite information in what light the canonical authority of the Apocalypse was regarded by Justin, Irenaeus, etc.; and that in general, at that period (Cent. II.), no definite and precise ideas were entertained about the nature of canonical authority. The writers of that day, he says, quote apocryphal as well as canonical books, and often in the same manner; so that it becomes difficult for us to say how they always regarded the one and the other.

I cannot help feeling, that there is something unfair in the manner and even matter of this representation. Is it not true, that Justin, and Irenaeus, and Tertullian, beyond all question regarded the Apocalypse as the work of John the apostle, and therefore as a divine book? It surely is; as the reader may see by recurring to the preceding pages. What more is necessary to determine the *rank* which the book held in their view? What more could be said of any other book of the New Testament? If now they quote other books than the present canonical ones of the New Testament, this is only what is done every day by religious writers of the present time, who admit the highest claims of the New Testament books. Why might not the writers of the second century quote other religious books than those of the present New Testament? The fair question is: Did they assert or claim, that the other books which they quoted were *inspired* or *apostolic?* Where are the declarations of this kind? Nay more: Where is the distinction in this respect more prominent and stringent, than in Tertullian and Irenaeus? The formal and scientific discussion of *canonicity* had not indeed then commenced; but the substantial thing aimed at or accomplished by such a discussion, was already recognized by these writers. The very existence of the New Testament canon, in the definite shape which it assumed at the close of the second century, is full proof of the correctness of this statement; at all events in regard to the church at large. And as to the quotation of apocryphal books, how little of this

there is in Clement of Rome, Justin, Tertullian, and Irenaeus, must be obvious to every attentive reader.

When Lücke complains, that there was no *scientific* investigation of the canonical credit of the Apocalypse in the second century, or in the early ages (p. 447 seq.), and draws the inference that we can learn nothing certain or to be relied upon from the testimony of those times; I am constrained once more to ask: How does the Apocalypse, in this respect, differ from any other book of the New Testament? Is it not even controverted, at present, whether Justin cites the proper Gospels at all? And where in Irenaeus and Tertullian are evidences of any higher, and more direct, and more critical nature, in respect to any of the books of the New Testament, than there are in respect to the Apocalypse? They all stand on the same level. If the Apocalypse falls, on this ground, then all the other books must fall with it. Lücke has never yet shown, even by a single word, that the cases of these two different parts of the New Testament rest upon a different basis. He admits, however, that the opposition of the Alogi and of Caius, in the second century, to the Apocalypse, arose from no critical examination, but from mere religious prejudice; which, indeed, is plain enough.

With Origen begins the second period of the canonical history. Here is no room to aver, that there was no *critical* examination. Origen was confessedly the greatest critic, save one, among all the Christian fathers. He divided the books claiming to be sacred, into three classes, viz. *γνήσια*, *νόθα*, and *μικτά*. The first comprises those which are undoubtedly *genuine;* the second, the *spurious;* the third, either the *controverted* or the *doubtful* ones. To the last class he assigns the Epistle of Jude, 2 John, 3 John, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas. Now, since he makes no mention of the Apocalypse as ranking with these, it is quite certain, as we have seen (p. 323 seq.), that he regarded the Apocalypse as belonging to the *γνήσια* or genuine books. What more can Lücke ask for, than this testimony of Origen as to his own and the general opinion and belief of the churches at that period?

Subsequent to this, what was the state of opinion has already been amply exhibited in the preceding pages. Dionysius of Alexandria, the pupil of Origen, doubted, as we have seen, the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse, but not its divine inspiration or canonical credit; as he explicitly assures us. Eusebius, moved by his critical doubts and by his opposition to Chiliasm, remained in a state of oscillation. In his Demonstrationes Evang. he cites the Apocalpyse in the usual way, as a divine book, (see p. 356 above); in his Hist. Ecc. he states grounds for doubt, and seems disposed to class the book among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, while he still hesitates to do so, on account of the strong feeling among the churches in its favour. Among several of the fathers in Asia Minor

of the fourth century, the Apocalypse appears, in some respects at least, to have stood in the back-ground. They were opposed to Chiliasm, specially in the form of Montanism; and the Apocalypse was regarded as the main authority of those who held to such opinions. Moreover the book was acknowledged by all to be obscure and difficult of interpretation. Hence it became a usage, somewhat extensive in the eastern region, to exclude this book from the catalogue of those which were to be publicly read; as we have seen in the cases of Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Philastrius, pp. 329 seq. Nothing certain about the inspiration or divine authority of the Apocalypse can be argued from its omission in such a catalogue; as is plain from the discussion in the pages to which I have just referred. It seems probable that Cyrill of Jerusalem, and some others of his day, thought of the Apocalypse much as Luther did, at the early period of the Reformation. But this state of things among the churches appears to have been temporary and local. The region of the Montanists is the region where it mainly prevailed; and as to the time of its continuance, the days of Andreas, and Arethas, and of the Philoxenian Version, all show that there was speedily a contrary state of things. In fact nothing can be more certain, than that the authority of Jerome, and Augustine, and their compeers, in the western portion of the churches, speedily became triumphant through almost the whole of Christendom. Since the first half of the fifth century, only now and then a solitary voice has been raised against the Apocalypse, either in the way of doubt or of opposition. The mass of Christendom have regarded the question as settled, and have felt no interest to renew the discussion. Now and then, some individual who had closely studied the account which Eusebius gives of the canonical books, and canvassed the arguments of Dionysius, or of some others, against the Apocalypse, ventured to assume a doubting posture. There is always, among men of nearly every age, a class of minds who are more moved by doubts, than by arguments in favour of anything. Sometimes vanity or the desire of distinction from the common herd moves to this; at other times, a mind bursting the bonds of mere traditional belief will be attracted by things of this nature, and will pursue them with uncommon avidity. But whatever it might be that moved the very few doubters about the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, through all the dark ages of monkery and superstition, it is quite certain, that none of them ever had influence enough to alter the general state of belief among the churches. Down to the time of Erasmus and Luther, the book in question held its rank in the canon among other books of the New Testament; although it was not publicly read in the same manner and measure as the other books. But this we must regard as almost a matter of course, when the contents of the book are taken into view.

Erasmus, in the first edition of his Greek Testament, has inserted, in his Remarks on the Apocalypse, some intimations of doubt among the Greek churches of ancient times respecting it, as testified by Jerome; see p. 333 above. (Eras. Nov. Test. 1516, but much more fully in edit. 1527). Erasmus himself thinks it strange, that the writer of the Apocalypse so often mentions his own name, contrary to the usage of John. Paul, he significantly suggests, relates his visions (2 Cor. xii.) with great modesty. Besides, the title to the book is *Ἰωάννης θεόλογος*. The difference of style, he further suggests, is also great between John's Gospel and the Apocalypse. All this, he says, makes him doubt about the *apostolic* origin of the book; "unless indeed the general consent of the Christian world should be in favour of it, or especially the *authority* of the church defend it, if indeed the church should determine in its favour." So Erasmus was much in the same plight with Eusebius; critical arguments seemed to invite him one way, and the voice of the church another. He then goes on to relate the doubts of Dionysius of Alexandria, of Eusebius, of Caius the Roman presbyter, etc.; and he concludes with naming several of the fathers who were its strenuous defenders, but who were strong Chiliasts. All this is merely a masked battery for assault. Finally he comes out with the conclusion, that the book being made up of visions and allegories, cannot be so profitable as some others; and in order to soften down this, he suggests that even among precious jewels, one kind of gold may be much more pure and valuable than another. All of this shows in reality his secret doubts; it shows also how timid he was in venturing to say anything, which would call in question the usual and established opinions of the Romish church.

The opinion of Luther, expressed in the preface to his German translation of the New Testament printed in 1522, has already been cited at some length, on pp. 412 seq. above. Luther was, as we should expect, open and avowed to all the world, as to his sentiments concerning the Apocalypse; and in this respect he differed greatly from Erasmus. But his doubts did not extend merely to the Revelation. The Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, and of Jude, also shared in his doubts; and they were printed by Luther merely as an appendix to his version of the New Testament, and without number or page. This arrangement by which these four books were excluded from the canon, was continued, in the Lutheran editions of the Bible, down to the beginning of the 17th century. In some cases they were even printed with the title of *Apocrypha*. The strict followers of Luther, for a long time, and in fact even down to the middle of the 17th century, refrained from appealing to them as canonical. They virtually classed them with the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* of Eusebius. Gradually they came to be regard-

ed as *deutero-canonical.* Texts might be cited from them to illustrate and confirm other passages from the canonical books, but not to establish any doctrine which was not elsewhere taught. It is a comparatively recent thing, among the Lutheran theologians, to refer to these suspected books in the same manner as to others. But since the criticism which is quite recent, has virtually and extensively given up the idea of *inspiration,* the once suspected books would seem to be entitled to as good, or very nearly as good, a rank as the others, and the appeal to them without any particular distinction has become quite general. Among those, however, whether in the Lutheran church or elsewhere, who believed in the inspiration of *all* the books in the present New Testament canon, it was not to be expected that any such distinction as Luther and the earlier Lutherans made, could be kept up when appeal was made to the New Testament Scriptures. The authority of all the books in it was, as we shall soon see, regarded as being for substance the same.

Luther himself grew milder in his judgment respecting the Apocalypse, when he found a *Commentarius* on this book, which had been written a century before, and which represented the Pope as *antichrist.* The Reformer reprinted that Commentary, with a preface of his own. In this preface he states, that the Apocalypse may belong to that class of prophecies which are concerned merely with symbols and figures, and which are hinted at in Acts 2: 17, in the quotation made by Peter from the book of Joel. Still, even here he does not retract his own personal doubts; but he leaves the matter of admitting the Apocalypse entirely free to others.

It is somewhat singular, that at this very period, (the second quarter of the 16th century), the leading and most influential persons concerned with the reformation in Switzerland, adopted views respecting the Apocalypse much like those of Luther. At the conference between the Romanists and the Reformers, at Bern in 1528, Zuingle refused to admit *proof-texts* from the Apocalypse, "because it was not a *biblical* book," i. e. not a canonical one; (Werke. II. Abth. 1. p. 169 seq.). In this he was joined by Oecolampadius and Bucer, who were present; none of them regarding the Apocalypse as authoritative. But this state of feeling does not seem to have been propagated in the *Reformed* or Calvinistic churches. Calvin, Beza, and their successors, admitted fully and readily the canonical and apostolical authority of the book in question. Hence it has always been recognized as such, in all the Creeds of the so called *Reformed* churches. This was a point, therefore, in which the Reformed churches stood opposed to or distinguished from the Lutheran, during the latter half of the sixteenth century, and for some time afterwards.

Even in the Lutheran church, however, there were some distinguished men, so early as the sixteenth century, who were favourably inclined to the Apocalypse. Melancthon himself did not sympathize with Luther on this point; and Francis Lambert and Chytraeus openly defended the apostolic origin of the book. But in the second quarter of the 17th century, the famous theologian, John Gerhard, in his *Uberior Expositio* respecting the holy Scriptures, took the ground that the Apocalypse was *deutero-canonical;* by which he meant merely that the professed authorship had been doubted by some. But its divine authority was not represented by him as being dependent on this circumstance. The great learning and influence of this writer brought the Apocalypse gradually into credit among the Lutheran churches, after that period, down to the time when the progress of recent criticism awakened new doubts and undermined, in the view of a large portion of the German critics, not only the *apostolical* origin of the Apocalypse, but the inspiration of all the books of Scripture, and consequently their absolute and decisive authority. The main test or evidence of authority seems now to be this, viz., whatever agrees with our reason and understanding, may be regarded as obligatory; and whatever does not, is to be regarded as indicative only of the feelings, views, or prejudices of the writer, and we are not bound by it.

The history of this new revolution in the Lutheran churches (for it is mostly confined as yet to them), might well occupy a little volume, replete with critical interest. But it would be aside from my purpose to do anything more than merely advert to a few of its prominent features.

It is rather remarkable, that the first movement in the last war against the Apocalypse, was made in England. A New Version of the Greek Testament, author unknown, was published in London, in 1729, accompanied by Notes. In these the translator attacks even with bitterness the credit of the Apocalypse, relying principally for his support on the criticisms of Dionysius of Alexandria. This publication was followed, in 1730, by a *Discourse Historical and Critical on the Revelation;* in which almost everything that could render the credit of the book doubtful, is suggested and urged with much adroitness. It turned out in the end, that this was an English translation of the celebrated Firmin Abauzit's *Discours historique sur l'Apocalypse.* († 1767). Abauzit was an intimate friend of Bayle and Newton. At the request of an English friend, William Burnet, he wrote the Discourse, and sent it to him; and by him, perhaps, it was translated into English; for the name of the translator is not given. This book is generally regarded as marking the commencement of a new period, in the criticism of the Apocalypse. It called forth from Dr. Leonard Twells, in his Critical Examination (Part

III.) of the New Testament in Greek and English, a vindication of the Revelation;—a vindication, the worth of which is even now generally acknowledged. It was soon afterwards translated by Wolf into Latin, and inserted in his Curae Philologicae in Nov. Test. With this work of Twells, the controversy at that time seems to have subsided in England, Twells being generally regarded as victorious in the contest.

About the middle of the 18th century, attention to the critical study and literature of the Scriptures began to take a new turn, and to shoot up with fresh life, in several of the Universities of Germany. At this period, the *Free Investigation of the so-called Revelation by John*, was written by Oeder, and published after his death by Semler, with additional notes. It is a small book, replete with evidences of great zeal against the Apocalypse, and exhibits in some respects no ordinary degree of acuteness. Oeder and his learned editor appear, however, to have no perception of any aesthetical merit in the Apocalypse. They put to its account all the extravagant commentaries that have been written upon it, and express themselves, in view of these, with all imaginable contempt; while neither of them was qualified by his taste or turn of mind duly to appreciate, much less to explain, a book of such a nature as that of the Revelation. The extravagance of maintaining that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse, as well as the general spirit of the Free Investigation, prevented the favourable reception of the work in question, except among the school of Semler. Still, the book became the means of rousing up a spirit of inquiry into the critical history of the canon in general, as well as of the Apocalypse, which has not yet ceased, but is becoming more and more animated, even at the present period.

Semler was soon opposed by several writers of high character. Reuss of Tübingen published his De Auctore Apocalypseos, Tüb. 1767; and afterwards, in 1772, an edition in German with additional strictures on a defence made by Semler, which Reuss entitled Vertheidigung der Offenbarung Johannis. About the same time, C. F. Schmid, at Wittenburg, published his Ob die Offenbar. Johannis ein echtes göttliches Buch sey? and also his Historia antiqua et Vindicatio Canonis, 1775. Both of these are filled with the fruits of great learning and research; although at times the author's zeal gets the better of his judgment and good temper. In 1773, Knittel of Wolfenbüttel also published his Beiträge zur Kritik über Johan. Offenbarung. All of these were able works, and roused up Semler and his adherents to make strenuous opposition. Still, the contest, for the most part, was managed with a good degree of decency and moderation. The consequence of it, moreover, has not been unimportant; for the questions raised about the Apoca-

lypse have since then been better understood and more fully discussed, than they were or had been previous to this period.

Among those who distinguished themselves in the controversy that followed this commencement of the war, may be mentioned Corrodi in his Geschichte des Chiliasmus, and Merkel in his Histor. crit. Aufklärung der Streitigkeit, etc.; both of whom entertained, for the most part, the same views as Semler; while Storr in his Neue Apologie der Offenbarung, and Hartwig in his Apologie der Apokalypse wider falschen Tadel und falschen Lob, strenuously and ably defended the genuineness of the Revelation. All these books were published between 1780—85; a full proof of the deep interest excited by the Semlerian controversy.

Since that period, every Introduction to the critical history of the New Testament has of course discussed the question of the *apostolic* origin of the Apocalypse. Michaelis interested himself much in it; but in his Introduction he finally takes the position of Eusebius, or perhaps of Dionysius. He had a Mss. copy of Abauzit's *Discours* in his hands, and evidently was much influenced by it. Then, as a Lutheran, he might follow in the steps of the great Reformer and of the early Lutherans. Herder and Eichhorn, by their distinguished Commentaries on the Apocalypse, made an effectual vindication of its *aesthetic* merits, and placed the book in an attitude before the public mind, which writers like Storr and Hartwig could not well portray. It seemed, for awhile, as if the contest was to subside and the churches settle down again in their former belief, but with more enlightened views of the nature of the Apocalypse. But the adventurous spirit of recent criticism is rarely able to settle down in what has already been believed, in case there is any good room for even a moderate measure of doubt, or any difficulty which cannot be wholly removed. We find, therefore, a formidable host of critics arranged on either side of the question about *apostolic* origin; most of them developing their views in formal Introductions to the New Testament, or in Commentaries upon the Apocalypse. AGAINST the apostolic origin are Heinrichs, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette, Ewald, Schott, Lücke, Credner, and others; FOR it are Haenlein, Schmidt, Kleuker, Herder, Hug, Eichhorn, Feilmoser, Lange, Bertholdt, Guerike, Kolthoff, Danemann, and others. When Lücke published his Introduction to the Apocalypse (1832), the majority, as he states, held fast the Johannean origin. Among the critical portion of the German public, this would seem, at the present, no longer to be the case. Lücke's work has itself done much toward leading the minds of the learned to an opposite conclusion. There is a moderation in his book, a general fairness of reasoning, a sobriety, an apparent absence of prejudice and party feeling, an extent and depth of learning, which can nowhere and at no time fail to win respect and more or less

of confidence. Among the great mass, even of critics, who have never studied deeply and thoroughly the literature of the Apocalypse, and the nature of the book, it is no wonder that such a work as Lücke's should be regarded as entitled to great deference. In a question so difficult as that respecting the author of the book, it is more pleasant and easy to be guided, than to make the efforts which are adequate to render oneself able to think independently. Hence, with De Wette and Bleek and Schott and Ewald and Credner to aid the cause for which Lücke pleads, no wonder that Germany, at the present time, is again on the high road toward the positions of Semler; although several of his most rash and extravagant positions would be generally rejected. Semler's *aesthetical* views, for example, and Oeder's opinion that *Cerinthus* wrote the Apocalypse, will probably find few if any advocates hereafter.

It is not to be understood, from this statement, that no learned advocates of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse can now be found in Germany. This would be remote from the truth; for several recent discussions of this subject have appeared, which support the Johannean or apostolic origin. Yet the majority of critics who seem to bear sway in Germany, would appear to side with Lücke.

In England and in this country, the question before us has not been mooted for this long time. At least no serious effort, from a respectable quarter, has been made in regard to the *critical history* of the Apocalypse. In both countries, we have books almost without number, which tell us what dynasties, or civil events, or wars, or political and religious changes, the Apocalypse has predicted—the offspring, in some cases, of respectable learning and perhaps of warm piety; in other cases, of mere ignorance of the true manner and matter of biblical prophecy; and in some, of adventurous enthusiasm and rank prejudice and overweening self-conceit. Any and every man, even those who could not read a word of Greek or Hebrew, has felt at liberty to speculate and to write upon this book, and to lay before the world the fruit of his crude and incongruous speculations. The Apocalypse would seem, as viewed by them, to have been written in order *to make men prophets*, rather than to be written by a prophet and submitted to sober readers for exposition. Scarcely any five years have passed, now for a long time, in which some work of the character just described has not made its appearance, in England or America. But most works of this nature never come to a second edition. They have been unlucky enough, it may be, to fix on the destruction of Antichrist (the Pope), or on the commencement of the Millennium, at a period which is now gone by; and so of course the book vanishes along with the time. Such has now been the fate of Bengel's famous work on the Apocalypse, which cost him some twenty years of labour, and which for a long time was much talked about both

on the continent of Europe and in England. But Bengel found his grand period of *consummation* in A. D. 1836; and this alas! has passed by, without any noticeable changes of the world either in a civil or religious respect. So have fallen many other like works, in England and in this country, entitled to immeasurably less respect than Bengel's; and so the remainder of this class of works, which have made the Apocalypse a mere Syllabus of civil and ecclesiastical history, are destined to fall. A few years more will sweep away all the baseless fabrics which they have erected.

Deeply is it to be regretted, that instead of radical investigation of the literature and exegesis of the Apocalypse, by the rules of criticism and philology adopted in all other cases, the English and American writers have, for the most part, expended their time and talents in making out some ingenious and fine-spun theory about the beast and false prophet, and about the time of their development and destruction, which amounts, and never can amount, to nothing more than a kind of specious hariolation or vaticination. Time has already demonstrated this respecting a large class of books composed by writers' of this cast; and there is no presumption in saying, that the rest of them are ere long to sink into oblivion in the same way. There must be some ground in language, in the nature of the occasion, in the historical circumstances of the times, and in the general nature of the composition, on which any interpretation can find a permanent resting place. There must be some other menstruum in which difficulties can be solved, besides the Pope, and the 1260 days turned into years, and Mohammed, and the Saracens, and Buonaparte.

I have said nothing, as yet, of the critical history of the Apocalypse in the *Romish* church, since the Reformation. Nothing more need be said, than that about the middle of the 16th century the Council of Trent explicitly admitted the Apocalypse as a divine book and of Johannean origin, and sanctioned it accordingly. In that church, and, by a reflex influence, in the Greek churches, no one of any note, so far as I know, has appeared since, who openly calls this in question.

The present posture of the canonical credit or authority of the Apocalypse, is easily deduced from these premises. Excepting a class of critics in Germany, and some few elsewhere, this book is regarded as apostolic and authoritative by the Christian world in general.

Lücke himself, notwithstanding his decided rejection of the Johannean origin of the Apocalypse, does not propose to eject the book from the canon. A book *fully* canonical, he thinks, must have an *apostle* for its author; and this must be known with certainty. But as this would make only a narrow circle to move in, he proposes the admission of some other books, of secondary, and of course not of the highest, au-

thority, which may serve to explain and confirm the canonical books. Such are the books composed by the companions and fellow-labourers of the apostles, who, from their intimate connection with them, must have understood their views and feelings; e. g. the books of Mark and Luke, and perhaps the epistles of James, Jude, and possibly some others. It is essential that these books of the secondary order do not contradict the apostolic ones, and that the writers of them be known. But in case the writers are *not* known, Lücke proposes to class the books with the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* of Eusebius, or the *μικτά* of Origen. He would not refuse them a place in the canon, unless they are at variance with, or contradict, the books of the first rank.—Then they must be deemed apocryphal. Their proper office is, to explain and confirm the books of the first rank; but no doctrine can be *built* on what only these deutero-canonical books contain.

In this latter sense, he reckons the Apocalypse among the canonical books. The book, as he supposes, 'was undoubtedly written in the apostolic age, and sprung from actual circumstances then existing. It came, at all events, from some warm friend of the apostles and of Christianity. Its *form* is no decisive objection to it, although it differs in this respect from other New Testament books. It finds analogies in the Jewish Scriptures. Nor can it be properly decided *a priori*, that no book of the New Testament is to have a *prophetic* form.' It must surely be admitted, I would moreover suggest, by every reader of taste and discernment, that the Apocalypse differs widely from all the apocryphal compositions of that period, which exhibit attempts at a similar method of composition; e. g. the Book of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, the fourth of Ezra, and the like. What has made such a wide and striking difference? If he be not an apostle who wrote the Apocalypse, must he not have been an *apostolical man?*

Finally, Lücke canvasses the objections raised by Oeder against the Apocalypse, on the score of *doctrine*, and comes to the conclusion, that most of them are groundless, and others insignificant. For example; Oeder objected, that 'only the Apocalypse developes a regular progress and full completion of the kingdom of God;' whereas the New Testament throughout exhibits here and there the same views; comp. Matt. xxiv. xxv. 13: 36—50. Rom. xi. 2 Thess. ii. al. To this consideration I should add, that the Old Testament is replete with predictions of the like nature; comp. the view in § 2 above. The *terrestrial* reign of Christ, and the thousand years are also adduced as indicative of novelty and peculiarity of doctrine in the Apocalypse. The first of these objections depends, of course, merely on the mode of exegesis, and is subjective; the second differs from other views respecting the kingdom of

Christ in the New Testament, only in the apparent *limitation* of time. But is *one thousand*, in this case, anything more than the figurative expression of a *long* period? As to the *first* resurrection, at Christ's coming (Rev. 20: 4—6), which is also objected against the Apocalypse, in case we adopt the literal exegesis of the passage, we may still say that even this has been found, at last, to have analogies in other parts of the New Testament, and probably in the Old; see § 10, p. 175 seq. above. The assertion that Christ is substantially represented in a different manner, in the Apocalypse and the other books of the New Testament, is plainly and palpably erroneous; and is so, whether one regards his *dependence* as expressed in Rev. 1: 1, or his *supremacy* and his *equality* with Him that sitteth on the throne, as in 4: 4, 5, 8 seq. 5: 1—7, 8—14, etc.; for the like representations may be elsewhere found in the New Testament, and found in abundance; see Comm. on Rev. 1: 1, and on the other passages. The idea that believers will be *kings* and *priests* to God, so often recurring in the Apocalypse, is frequent also in other parts of Scripture, both in the New and Old Testaments; see Comm. on 1: 6. This cannot be urged, therefore, against the Apocalypse.

These, and more like to these, are the allegations of Oeder and others against the Apocalypse; by which they would fain prove, that it is no more than an apocryphal book. Lücke himself repels all these and the like charges, and settles down in the conclusion, that the Apocalypse should be admitted into our canon; but only as a book of the third class, i. e. as one of Antilegomena. The ground of this in his view is, that the *author* of the book is *unknown*.

If such were my persuasion, I might perhaps pursue the same course of deduction from the facts supposed to be true. But as I am fully persuaded, that, all things considered, the evidence is much stronger in favour of the *apostolic* origin than against it, so I must assign to the Apocalypse a place among Lücke's first class of canonical books. I have never yet been able, in any satisfactory way, to account for the early and uniform tradition with respect to the author of the Apocalypse, on any other ground than by supposing it to be founded on a matter of fact. The book sprung from Asia Minor, where John resided and acted; it appeared during his life time; it was addressed to churches with which he was conversant, and who must have known what writings were his; to churches friendly to him and zealous for his honour; to churches rebuked by the writer, and who would receive such reproof and admonition only from some one highly respected. Why then was not the forgery—or if one must employ softer words—the factitious composition, of the Apocalypse exposed? Nothing could have been easier than to expose it. And when the book makes such high claims to credit and reception—how could the seven churches lend an ear to all this, as

well as to its rebukes, unless they believed that all came from proper authority? I do not say that the factitious composition was impossible, but I cannot refrain from the conviction that it is highly *improbable.*

The result is plain. Those who believe with me, that the evidence on the whole is strong in favour of the position, that John the apostle wrote the Revelation, must of course regard this work as belonging to the books fully and in the highest sense canonical. In it I find no *doctrines* that are wholly unique or absolutely new, but only new modifications, or additional views, in various respects, of doctrines elsewhere taught.

§ 27. *Historical sketch of the Exegesis of the book.*

I make no adventurous assertion when I say, that there was a time, when the Apocalypse was read and rightly understood by the more intelligent class of readers. I can form no conception of an undertaking by a sensible man in sober earnest, to write a book which would be unintelligible to those to whom it is addressed. What object could he have in view? Supposing him to be, as I have said, in sober earnest, he of course would wish to impart his feelings and views to others, with whom he acted and for whom he sympathized. But how could he do this, in case he wrote in a manner unintelligible?

The original readers of the Apocalypse, then, it would seem nearly if not quite certain, understood the Apocalypse. I do not mean to say that *all* Christians belonging to the seven churches of Asia understood it. The nature of the book—it being a series of symbols with a great abundance of tropical diction—would of course elevate it above the ready understanding of the ignorant and the uninstructed in the Scriptures. It requires some experience and taste and a portion of critical discernment, to read at any time such a book as the Apocalypse in an intelligent manner. But this belongs to the Apocalypse in common with all, or at any rate with most, of the prophetic books. The books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, and indeed nearly all of the Hebrew prophets, made similar demands upon readers. The Paradise Lost of Milton, and many other poetical works in our language, may indeed be read by all who can read English, and many things in them can be understood and appreciated in a good measure, even by the middle and lower classes of readers. But to comprehend the whole—the plan, the execution of it, the diction, the allusions to classic and other lore, the tropical expressions, and other things of a like nature—this lies within the province of only a few.

Something like to this, must we suppose the case to have been with the Apocalypse and its original readers. It is not a book of simple history and plain didactics. It is poetic in its very nature; and its poetry

belongs to that class which is the most difficult of all to be understood and rightly appreciated, except by readers who are familiar with the Hebrew prophetic idiom. None can doubt or deny, that it is deeply tinctured with Hebrew colouring. Of course it is not to be fully understood and fully appreciated, except by such as have attained to some good degree of familiarity with this colouring.

Let me not be misunderstood, I do not say, that there are not very many things in this book, which every reader of common sense can peruse and understand, and by which he may be profited. Plainly there are. The great Christian virtues which it inculcates, of warm attachment to the Christian religion, of unshaken fidelity to it, of persevering confidence in its promises, of awful dread of its threatenings, of patience and quiet submission under persecution, of holy resolution to suffer and even die rather than forsake the cause of Christ, of ardent love to Christian brethren and sympathy with them—all these virtues are plainly and obviously commended by every part of the book, and the commendation and enforcement of them cannot be mistaken by any candid reader. But beyond the great and obvious ends of the book, there lies, under its abounding and magnificent drapery, many an idea which can be fully understood and appreciated, either in respect to its limits, true shape, or aesthetical value, only by the more informed reader.

Some such readers John must have had, among all the churches whom he addressed. In them all were doubtless more or less of those who were native Hebrews. John then could reasonably count upon being understood by some, who belonged to those churches which were addressed; and this was all that could be expected in regard to such a composition as the Apocalypse, and indeed all that was necessary. Such readers could explain the book to others.

Thus much the very nature of the case teaches us. We cannot, indeed, make out the history of apocalyptic exegesis in the apostolic age, i. e. during the first century, from any written documents; for such we do not possess. We only know, that very soon after this age, readers of the Apocalypse began to explain some parts of it in such a literal manner, as to throw in the way great obstacles to the reception of the book as canonical.

It seems more than probable, that Papias drew his *millennial* views from the Apocalypse, i. e. he gave to chap. 20: 2—4 a literal sense, and maintained a literal terrestrial reign of Christ and the saints. But however this may be, it is clear enough that Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, interpreted the Apocalypse, in regard to this matter, in a way which was substantially literal. The two former regarded the descriptions of the thousand years' reign on earth, of the first resurrection of the dead, of the new Jerusalem, of Antichrist, etc., as designed to be

literally interpreted in order to elicit the true meaning of the Apocalypse; and they combined also with the various predictions of this nature, in the second portion of the Apocalypse, various prophecies of the Old Testament, in particular many of those in the book of Isaiah. Whoever wishes to see the manner in which those fathers represent these subjects, and how they argue, may consult Justin, Dial. cum Tryphone, c. 81, and Irenaeus, Contra Haeres. V. c. 25—36. The latter is not destitute of some fine remarks, although he manifests occasionally much credulity and very fanciful modes of interpretation. Justin has said but little in relation to this subject; but that little shows that all the Christians of his day were not Chiliasts, in the sense in which he was.

As to Tertullian, the reader will find passages that give his views in his De Cultu Fem. 12 seq. Contra Marc. III. 14. 24. De Corona Mil. c. 15. Adv. Judaeos, c. 9. De Resurrect. Carnis, c. 26. More spirit, life, and aesthetical discernment, will be found in him than in Justin and Irenaeus. He had, with all his peculiar Latinity, a turn of mind essentially poetical and oratorical. His main book on the reign of Christ, viz. his De Spe Fidelium, to which he himself appeals for a full exposition of his views, is lost beyond the hope of recovery. It would be a book of great interest to the history of exegesis. Tertullian was a Chiliast. Of course, as a Montanist he would be one. But probably he would have been one without Montanism. He has developed his views sufficiently for us to see, that while he has more of the elements of taste and spirit and eloquence than Irenaeus or Justin, yet he seems to have differed from them only in his manner of interpreting particular texts. His general scheme of exegesis elicited from the Apocalypse the same leading ideas, that are advanced by those two writers.

All that we have, however, in the works of these fathers, gives us nothing more than a few of their opinions respecting the Apocalypse; and these are only of the most generic kind. They comprise in the main, also, only such views as are deduced from the latter part of the Apocalypse. How they disposed of chap. iv—xii, we do not know with any certainty.

The general interpretation which the Montanists also gave to the latter portion of the Apocalypse, is quite plain from the extravagance of their Chiliasm. No doubt these so-called heretics have been but partially represented to us, by those who were opposed to them. Had we Tertullian's defence of them, we should be better able to understand their true position. As it is, we must content ourselves with the knowledge, that they gave to some leading parts of the Apocalypse, respecting the coming and kingdom of Christ, a literal sense; perhaps a more extravagant one than Justin, Irenaeus, or other fathers gave, who were Chiliasts. Yet scarcely anything could be more extravagant, than some portion of Irenaeus' views.

Near the commencement of the third century, Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, and a pupil of Irenaeus (as Photius asserts), wrote, as Jerome declares, a commentary on the Apocalypse, as well as on many other portions of Scripture. Andreas and Arethas quote his commentary on the Apocalypse; but the book is lost, and we know of Hippolytus' opinions only through the medium of these quotations, and by what he has said in his book concerning Antichrist. Antichrist is, with him, the grand solution of the leading problems in Daniel and in the Apocalypse. The fourth beast in Daniel and the first in Apoc. xiii. are regarded as one and the same, and Antichrist is the antitype, and the grand agent who plays all the important parts. As a specimen of his mode of handling symbol and trope, we may advert to his remarks on Rev. 12: 1 seq. 'The woman is the church; the sun which encompasses her means the word of God; the moon under her feet indicates that her splendour is celestial; the crown of twelve stars indicates the twelve apostles; the woes of parturiency show that the church at all times is bringing forth the word of God, which suffers persecution by the world, etc.' In the sequel he says, that 'by the two eagles' wings, given to the woman in order to aid her flight, we are to understand a belief in Christ, who on the cross spread out his two hands like wings, for a protection to his followers.' These will show the reader at once the position of the commentator. Curious indeed the commentary must have been, which came from such a hand as is here developed. Ex ungue—leonem!

Hitherto all in the exegesis of the Apocalypse is fluctuating, arbitrary, and of course uncertain. No idea of any regular plan and connection throughout this book, seems to have suggested itself to the minds of the writers of that day. But let us turn for a moment to the Alexandrine School, and see what they did in regard to the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

Origen would have had no difficulty with this book. He had none as to its canonical authority. His mode of allegorizing would easily have enabled him to steer through the most difficult parts of the Apocalypse, without embarrassment. He could at any time resort to his favourite *anagoge*, i. e. transcendental or spiritualizing exegesis, and go through all obstacles. That he was entirely hostile to Chiliasm in the grosser sense, is well known; and the same is true of the other Alexandrine fathers in general. But he has left no Commentary behind him on the Apocalypse, although he seems to have had one in view; see Tract. 30 in Matt. It was easy for him, and Dionysius, and others of the African School who opposed Montanism and Chiliasm, to disembarrass themselves at any time of all trouble about particular passages in the Apocalypse. That they did so, at least that Origen did, there is no

doubt. But of the particular manner in which this was done, we have no specific account.

As yet, we have lighted upon nothing now extant but *fragments*, in respect to the exegesis of the Apocalypse. We come at last to an entire work, devoted to the explanation of this book; imperfect indeed, and doubtless interpolated and altered to a considerable extent, but still preserving such lineaments as will serve to give us an idea, how such a book as the Apocalypse was managed by expositors, near the close of the third century or at the beginning of the fourth.

VICTORINUS, bishop of Petavium in Pannonia, who died as a martyr about 303, wrote a commentary in Latin upon the Revelation, which, nominally at least, is still extant. But doubts have arisen among critics, how far this can be regarded as genuine. Jerome (Catal. Scriptt. c. 18) testifies of Victorinus, that he was a Chiliast, and had interpreted the Apocalypse accordingly. But the Commentary now before us says, respecting the millennial period: "Ergo audiendi non sunt, qui mille annorum regnum terrenum esse confirmant; qui cum Cerintho haeretico faciunt." In fact, the exposition given of the whole passage respecting the reign of a thousand years, although it is extremely arbitrary and indeed a mere conceit, yet shows that the writer was far enough from understanding the Apocalypse here in a literal sense. Besides this, the commentary appeals once to the epitome of ecclesiastical history by Theodorus, which was written in the 6th century; see in Biblioth. Maxima, III. p. 417. B., in which volume the whole commentary may be found. These are palpable evidences of interpolation at least, if indeed the whole work be not supposititious. That it is not, however, is strongly my impression, from frequent consultation of it. It presents some internal evidence of being composed in the Latin church, and not far from the period assigned to it. It makes no reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which at that period was doubted by some of the Latin church, (see p. 415, in the reckoning of Paul's epistles); it adverts to Nero's *reappearance* as Antichrist, (p. 420 D., see also my remarks and Excursus on Rev. 13: 3); it aludes to the Romish Senate as persecuting the church (p. 420 H.), all of which seems to favour the early composition of the work. In fact, there is one passage in it, which seems to have escaped the diligence of emendators, viz.—"in Judaea, ubi omnes sancti conventuri sunt, et Dominum suum adoraturi," (p. 415, D.); which favours the character given of the book by Jerome, i. e. that it was *Chiliastic*. The whole contour of the book corresponds well, in one respect, with what Cassiodorus (fl. 514) says of it, viz., that it undertook to explain only *some* of the most difficult passages. Putting all these considerations together, it would seem probable, that what Ambrosius Ansbertus (fl. 750) says

in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, respecting the work of Victorinus, is true: "Among the Latins, Victorinus first commented upon the Apocalypse. Jerome has followed on in his foot-steps; *expunging* certain things which the author literally interpreted, and adding some things of his own, he formed the whole into one book;" Bib. Max. XIII. p. 404, E. Probably it is for this reason, that Jerome never wrote any other commentary on the Apocalypse. Passages now in the work of Victorinus, which are later than Jerome's time, may have come from marginal annotations of later readers; and this is the more credible, because there are but few of this nature.

On the whole, we may admit that for substance we have before us a work of Victorinus; but still one which has been *spiritualized* by Jerome, who was much devoted to Origen's views of interpretation with respect to the difficult parts of the Scriptures. But the reader can scarcely form an idea of the execution of this work, without reading for himself. Everything is merely miscellaneous. No plan of the whole work is sought after, or even conceived of; no effort to get at the circumstances and relation of the writer of the Apocalypse and his times, and bring them to bear on the explanation of the book. The work is exceedingly brief; the whole Commentary occupying less than *seven* folio pages in the Bibliotheca. Grammatical and philological intrepretation are out of question; and the symbols are explained in the most arbitrary manner. Those that resemble each other, are regarded as mere repetitions of the same subject, although in a manner somewhat different; and so the writer oscillates from one position to another, very much as fancy would seem to dictate. No one can even think of gaining any exegetical satisfaction of consequence, from any portion of the work. Barren of appropriate ideas, and full of conceits, it can serve little other purpose than to remind one, at what a low ebb the science of interpretation stood, when Victorinus wrote this book. Yet it must not be supposed that there is nothing good to be found in his Commentary. Now and then a remark the reader will meet with, which is happily expressed and even striking.

We have seen how matters stood in respect to the Apocalypse, in the Greek churches after the time of Eusebius. It seems to have been generally withdrawn from the books that were to be publicly read in the churches; and by consequence, to have been withdrawn from particular attention, among the interpreters of the Scripture. Hence we find a Chrysostom and a Theodoret omitting it in their exegetical writings. Origen had promised a Commentary, but did not live to complete one. We find nothing of this nature among the Greeks, until we come down to the latter part of the fifth century, when we meet with a work, which is a kind of a continuous exegesis of the whole Apocalypse, written in

Greek by ANDREAS, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia. It is much of the like cast with the commentary of Victorinus, excepting that it is fuller, somewhat more sober, and has a little more of connection. Still we might well name it *Miscellaneous Remarks*. He refers occasionally to what other writers have said, respecting the book itself, or of certain passages in it, viz., Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Methodius, Epiphanius, and Gregory Nazianzen. But he seems to have had no full commentary on the book before him. Like Origen, he makes a three fold sense, as occasion seems to demand, viz. a literal, a tropological or moral, and an anagogical i. e. spiritual or transcendental, which last alludes to or exhibits the mysteries of the future and of eternal life under the veil of symbols. When one of these methods of interpretation will not satisfy the writer, he resorts to another; so that between them all, he is sure to find some solution of difficulties. As to *times* in the Apocalypse, although the book proclaims that the period of fulfilment is ἐγγύς, yet with God a thousand years are as one day, and *vice versa;* so, of course, no embarrassment can come upon his exposition from this quarter. The temple in Rev. 11: 1 seq. he regards as the temple of the Christian church; 11: 13 he regards as relating to a remote future; and chapter xii. with the sequel of the book, he regards as parts of what the seventh trumpet betokens. The number 666 he thinks will be certainly known only at the future appearance of Antichrist; 17: 10 he applies to heathen Rome, the seven kings are seven Roman emperors, the seven heads and hills are seven monarchies of the world, of which that of heathen Rome (when the Apocalypse was written) was the sixth, the seventh began with Constantine, and the eighth will be that of Antichrist. He refers 16: 19 to Jerusalem; and the division of the city into three parts he refers to the population of the city, which consisted of Jews, Samaritans, and Christians. He is hostile to grosser Chiliasm, and refers the thousand years to the abundance and fulness of the knowledge of God, which, after one thousand years from the birth of Christ, will everywhere be diffused. These hints may suffice to characterize the work. No regard is paid to any regular plan of the book, and very little to the circumstances of the writer and the events of the times. Nor must the reader expect anything of a *philological* cast, like that which characterizes the commentaries of the present day. Yet it is a more respectable work than that of Victorinus. But in vain will one search for connection and consistency in it, or for any light except that which a sensible man might throw upon the Apocalypse from conjecture. It is evident that he had not, in general, even tradition to guide his interpretations. But he is somewhat modest and diffident in proposing them, and does not appear in the light of a confident enthusiast.

ARETHAS, a successor of Andreas, and in the same bishopric, wrote

a still more copious commentary on the Apocalypse, and in the same style. He treads closely in the steps of his predecessor, and epitomizes him in some places, while he enlarges in others. Yet he is not destitute of independence of opinion. He gives some hints, here and there, of different views; and more than once seems to intimate that Rev. iv—xi. applies to the Jews and Jerusalem, although he would not exclude an ultimate reference to Antichrist. Here and there, too, he intersperses grammatical remarks, which are not without value.

It is singular that these two works should have made their appearance in that region of the church, where the Apocalypse had most fallen into desuetude. It would seem that the very object of the bishops before us, was again to bring the book into the notice and esteem of the churches, by endeavouring to render it more intelligible. And with their efforts appear to have ceased the labours of the Greek churches upon the Apocalypse. Oecumenius is thought by Montfaucon (Bib. Cois. fol. 277 seq.), to have written a Greek Catena on this book. The like is also said of Andreas of Crete, (Montf. Pal. Graec. fol. 231). But if they did write upon the Apocalypse, we have not their works; and the fact itself is uncertain.

In the Latin churches, where the Apocalypse maintained its ground, we should have expected from Jerome or Augustine some explanations of the book in question. But, excepting Jerome's remodelling of Victorinus, we have nothing more than occasional notices; e. g. in Augustine, De Civit. Dei. XX. 7—17. Jerome, we know, has said that the Apocalypse has as many mysteries as words, and that particular words have a manifold meaning; Ep. 53 ad Paulinum, § 8. He intimates, that Rev. 11: 2 cannot mean the literal Jerusalem, because that had been destroyed when the book was written; the present world therefore must be meant, which is to be renewed and restored to a paradisaical state. We know then, in general, how Jerome would have interpreted such a book.

Ticonius, the Donatist, a contemporary with Jerome and Augustine, wrote an *Expositio* of the Apocalypse. The work itself has perished; but from the testimony of others, it appears that he rejected all historical exegesis, and applied *anagoge* to every part of the book which appeared to be mysterious. Hence he obtained, of course, only general and undefined results, the offspring of conjecture or imagination.

Cassiodorus, about the middle of the sixth century, wrote brief explications, or *Complexiones* (as he calls them), of the Apocalypse. He follows in the track of Ticonius; to whom, indeed, he refers his readers for fuller information. Of the same character is the work of his contemporary, Primasius, bishop of Utica, who declines all historical connection in the Apocalypse, and all special historical relation. Chap. xi.

and xvii, for example, relate only to the state of the world in general, under the image of Jerusalem and of Rome. BEDA and AMBROSIUS ANSBERTUS, of the eighth century, merely repeat what had been before said, in the like style. Beda is particularly partial to Ticonius. He makes no attempt to find a plan and connection in the Apocalypse, but assumes a *parallelism* of visions in several parts, and thus confounds the whole. ANSBERTUS († 767) occasionally seeks for the grammatical sense. He seems first to have noted, that the Apocalypse is occasionally *regressive*. But his maxim, that the true and full sense of prophecy must be *typical* and *mysterious*, must of course mislead him. In commenting he is exceedingly arbitrary, sometimes passing from species to genus, and then from genus to species. The consequence is, that he has strangely commingled mystical, allegorical, and dogmatical meanings. He has drawn largely upon his predecessors, especially upon Primasius; and, on the whole, has made no important advances upon those who had preceded him.

Looking back from the close of the eighth century upon what had been done by commentators in the way of explaining the Apocalypse, we find that no real and solid advances were made. The great truth, that Christ's kingdom would come, and that all the enemies of the church would be subdued, was indeed evident to all the expositors. But how to dispose of all the imagery and symbols; how to unfold the book in a grammatical, rhetorical, or historical respect; how to lay open the plan of the work, to point out its unity, its progress, and its mutual connection; in a word, how to appeal to the circumstances of the writer, of the churches addressed, or of the actors in the scenes who are presented by symbols—all this surpassed the exegetical knowledge of the times. Of course it was impossible but that attempts to explain, without a proper regard to all these things, must turn out to be failures.

From this period on to the dawning of the Reformation, the darkest part of the dark ages, no one conversant with the history of the times will expect anything important in the way of exegesis. The theology of the Schoolmen did indeed, in their way, make some advances during this period. Speculative theologians, of great acuteness in some instances, were not wanting. But whatever of commentary on the Apocalypse appeared, it was for the most part only a repetition of what had already been said, or the suggestion of something more of the same tenor and in the like way. The reader who wishes for an enlarged catalogue of interpreters of the Apocalypse, at this period, may find one in Lücke, p. 613 seq. I deem it unnecessary to repeat it here, as it is rather a matter of mere literary curiosity than of exegetical interest. Instead of this, I would merely suggest the two leading principles which

guided most of the commentators of this period; in accordance with what Lücke has suggested, p. 514 seq.

(1) The position of Andreas, that the *thousand* years of chap. xx. must be counted from the first institution of the Christian church, which in itself was the first resurrection, was generally admitted. Of course the writers who preceded A. D. 1000, and who adopted such views, were looking with great anxiety to the events that would immediately follow the arrival of this period. Antichrist was then to reappear (Gog and Magog were regarded as symbols of him), and the end of the world was speedily to follow. As the period drew near, great excitement naturally prevailed in regard to it; not unlike to that which has several times existed among a limited class of enthusiastic men, in Europe and this country, with respect to the end of the famous period of 1260 years. But when the thousand years had gone by, and things remained in *statu quo*, of course the tone of commentary was changed. The thousand years now began to be viewed as a large and indefinite period, the like to which could be found in other parts of Scripture; so that no one could venture to predict the exact time of their end. This of course gave some check to the development of enthusiasm respecting the Apocalypse; but it did not remedy the other difficulties that lay in the way of a proper exposition of the book.

(2) So late as the 13th century began the far more important and influential error of regarding the Apocalypse as a kind of *nucleus* or *syllabus* of ecclesiastical and civil history, down to the end of the world. "Prophecy," says Lücke with much force, "appeared to be the compass which the divine Spirit had given to the church, on her voyage over the wide sea of time, in order that she might at any moment determine where she was, how long she must still maintain her contest, and whither she should direct her course." The seven churches of Asia came to be reckoned as symbols of so many different states of the church general; and the latter presented to the view of Romish expositors a symbol of the Romish church, as affected by various events and phenomena, during the whole period of her state as the church militant. The anti-christian power, in the Apocalypse, was specially recognized in the Saracens, and Mohammed was pointed out as the false prophet. The number of the beast (666) was applied to the duration of the Mohammedan power; and pope Innocent III. was able to rouse up nearly all the churches of Europe, and enlist them in a Crusade, by virtue of an appeal to them on such a ground.

On like grounds, the various heresies, (as the Romish church named all opposition to itself), were regarded as having also been included and predicted under the symbol of the false prophet. There never could be any difficulty to an ingenious man, in pointing out many resemblances

between the prediction and the events or persons supposed to be predicted. Boundless scope was given to imagination, conjecture, witty applications of certain expressions in the Apocalypse, and in a word to everything but a truly historico-exegetical mode of exposition. With deep regret I am compelled to add, that while the application of the symbols in the Apocalypse has been greatly changed, in many respects, from that which the Romish expositors maintained, yet the *principle* itself which led to the making of the book a mere syllabus of civil and ecclesiastical history, has been transferred unimpaired to the Protestant church, and remains, down to the present hour, as the current one in England and in America. But the *beast* and the *false prophet* have been applied in a manner very different from that which the inventors of such an exegesis intended; for they are now applied, by most Protestants, to the corrupt Romish church itself and to her false teachers. It is thus that a wrong begun in order to injure others, not unfrequently comes down upon the heads of its inventors and perpetrators.

In the Romish church itself commentators have not been wholly wanting, who have made offensive applications of the Apocalypse to its corruptions. Such an one was the abbot JOACHIM, who in his *Admiranda Expositio Apocalypseos* has given a new and peculiar turn to several things. He divides the world into three states, viz. that of the Father, which continued till the coming of Christ; secondly that of the Son, which was to last until the Millennium; thirdly that of the Spirit, which is to be the great sabbatical period of the world. So far as I have been able to trace the matter, he is the first who made out of 1260 *days*, in Rev. 11: 3, as many *years*, during which the State of the Son was to continue. These years he regarded as then about coming to an end, (fl. cent. XII.), and he urged with great earnestness a reformation upon the churches. His book was not aimed against the pope directly; but when the latter quarrelled with the Franciscans, to which order Joachim belonged, it would seem that they did not scruple to insert passages in Joachim's book, which bore very hardly upon popery.

Other enemies of the Romish church, the Waldenses, the Wicliffites, the Hussites, and others, did not fail to take the hint thus offered to them. Rome, which had so long been endeavouring, by its exposition of the Apocalypse, to put down first the Saracens, then all heretical opposers of its own dogmas, now experienced in her turn a retribution of the same nature. It was not difficult to satisfy such as groaned under the Romish papal yoke, that Rev. xiii—xviii. might, with great propriety, be applied to superstitious and tyrannizing and persecuting Rome.

But did the Reformation itself introduce any new method of interpreting the Apocalypse, on grounds independent of party feeling, and sup-

ported by the essential and now generally acknowledged principles of historico-philological exegesis?

It laid the foundation for such an exegesis, by substantially adopting it in the interpretation of the historical and doctrinal books of Scripture. In the latter, the application was easy and obvious. But we have seen, that not only Luther and his early followers slighted the Apocalypse, but that such was the case with Zuingle and his friends. After the credit of the Apocalypse began to revive and was generally established among Protestants, more attention began to be given to the Revelation. Yet the difficulty was still very great. Even the Hebrew prophets were not, at that period, recognized as proper poets. How could the nature of prophetic symbol, trope, and generally of the prophetic style, be well understood at such a period? And if they were not, how could it be expected that the Apocalypse would be interpreted in accordance with enlightened principles of criticism? In some respects this is doubtless the most difficult of all the prophetic books; and while exegesis was in such an undefined state as at this period, it could not well be explained from the stand-point which the more recent interpretation of the sacred books has assumed. The temptation to make out a meaning from the Apocalypse, which would be appropriate to party and sectarian purposes, was very great; and for a long time, few resisted this temptation. Meanings directly opposite, defended by adverse parties, would of course be the result of such methods of interpretation. Every interpretation not grounded on proper historico-exegetical principles simply, must be variable and shifting from side to side. Yet even to the present hour there are many expositors of the Apocalypse, who do not appear to have any adequate apprehension of this, and who endeavour to supply the lack of principle by confidence of assertion.

Early in the sixteenth century, Erasmus and Laurentius Valla in their commentaries, aimed only at explaining occasionally the sense of *words* in the Apocalypse. Erasmus, as we have seen, had doubts about the apostolical origin of the book; and neither he nor Valla pretended to know the meaning of it.

We have seen how decidedly Luther rejected it at first; and also how he gradually yielded to giving it some authority, on account of the antipapistical use which could easily be made of it. In 1528 he found and republished the famous and anonymous *Commentarius*, written one hundred years before his time, which applied the predictions of the Apocalypse to the papacy. Finally, in 1534, Luther himself published some comments on the Revelation; which partook in a large measure of the spirit of the age. He assumed that the Apocalypse was an epitome of church-history; and then, at his pleasure, searched for events here and there, which he thought would accord with the apocalyptic descriptions.

For example, the little book in Rev. 10: 10, which was bitter and sweet to John, he applies to the papacy with its great spiritual pretences. The thousand years, chap. xx, he dates from the time when the Apocalypse was written, and extends it to the time of Gregory VII; and then he reckons the 666 in 13: 18, as so many years from that time, during which the anti-christian papacy will continue. Gog and Magog, he says, mean the Turks and the red (?) Jews; and he expects the last judgment to follow closely the appearance of these. Finally, he suggests that the Apocalypse may be used for the consolation of Christians in times of persecution and distress, and also for a warning against the introduction of dangerous and offensive errors into the church.

This work of Luther became a kind of general model for succeeding expositors in the Protestant churches. Down even to the present hour, the idea of regarding the Apocalypse as a compendium of ecclesiastical and civil history, has been eagerly grasped at, and solicitously retained, among far the greater mass of Protestant expositors. It has been kept up by the same circumstances which introduced it, viz., the opposition of Protestants to the Romish church and the papacy, and the ease with which certain portions of the Apocalypse may be applied to them. The fact that some portions of Rev. xii—xix. are altogether incompatible with the idea of any but a *heathen* and *truly idolatrous* power which is opposed to the church, is entirely overlooked, by reason of the many traits of apparent resemblance to the corrupt Romish church, which can be traced without much effort in the remainder.

The general principle of considering the Apocalypse as a compendium of history, foreshadowed by symbol, prevailed not only among the Lutheran, but also among the Reformed churches. To this there are but few exceptions among the Protestant commentators of those times. Such men, for example, as Beza and Camerarius, move very cautiously in respect to the Apocalypse, and limit themselves mostly to the explanation of words and tropes. The *practical* uses of the book were not so widely missed as its general meaning. Consolation amid trials, warning, reproof, above all the repulse of the papal claims, and the glorious hopes of the future, were deduced from the Apocalypse, and were proclaimed in the pulpit and from the press. The long continued and vigorous contest with the papacy gradually drew the attention of the Lutheran divines more and more to the Apocalypse, and reconciled them to it, because they could so easily convert it into a magazine of armour, which might be employed in attacking the papal enemy, or in defending themselves.

It may easily be supposed, that while all was thus floating and uncertain, while every one was at liberty to select facts from history which he might bring into union with the predictions of the Apocalypse, a great

variety of particular modes of explanation would arise. Such was the state of the case. One, for example, dated the 1000 years from the birth of Christ; another from his death; a third from the establishment of a Christian church; a fourth from Constantine the Great, etc. Of course, these considered the prediction of a Millennium as already fulfilled, but only in a *spiritual* sense; while some few looked forward to a terrestrial reign of Christ, at some future period. So long as the *times* of the Apocalypse remained undefined and unfixed, everything of course must be in a floating state, when such a mode of interpretation is adopted. The new heavens and new earth and new Jerusalem were more generally referred to a future state of blessedness.

It must of course be a result of applying Rev. xiii—xix. to the *papacy*, that the 1000 years were considered as still future. In general a spiritual view was taken of the meaning of the passage respecting this period, and the gross Chiliasm of ancient times was repelled with much positiveness.

Toward the end of the sixteenth century, Joseph Scaliger made the declaration, that he understood the Apocalypse as far as the end of the *seven woes;* beyond this, he could not settle the question, whether it belonged to the past or the future. Later than the time of saying this, he seems to have had doubts about the apostolic origin of the book. It was he that uttered the famous declaration respecting Calvin, who did not comment upon the book of Revelation, which has been so often repeated, and is still often addressed to those who undertake to explain the Apocalypse, viz., "Calvinus sapit, quod in Apocalypsin non scripsit."

It might of course be expected, that the Romish church would not be idle, while the Protestant interpreters were so busy in applying the beast and the false prophet of the Apocalypse to the papacy. Cardinal Bellarmin especially undertook to show that the Antichrist of the Apocalypse was yet to come; De Rom. Pontif. III. 3. The Spanish Jesuit Ribeira († 1591), in his commentary on the Apocalypse (1591), aims, however, more at illustrating the grammatical and historical sense of the book, and seems shy of adopting a mystical sense. The strain of his work is more impartial than was common at that period.

Near the commencement of the seventeenth century (1614), the Spanish Jesuit Ludovicus ab Alcassar published his *Vestigatio arcani Sensûs in Apocalypsi;* a performance distinguished by one remarkable feature, which was then new. He declared the Apocalypse to be a *continuous* and *connected* work, making regular advancement from beginning to end, as parts of one general plan in the mind of the writer. In conformity with this he brought out a result which has been of great importance to succeeding commentators. Rev. v—xi., he thinks, applies to the Jewish enemies of the Christian church; xi—xix. to hea-

then Rome and carnal and worldly powers; xx—xxii. to the final conquests to be made by the church, and also to its rest, and its ultimate glorification. This view of the contents of the book had been merely hinted before, by Hentenius, in the Preface to his Latin Version of Arethas, Par. 1547. 8vo.; and by Salmeron in his Praeludia in Apoc. But no one had ever developed this idea fully, and endeavoured to illustrate and enforce it, in such a way as Alcassar. He applies chap. xiii—xix. of course only to heathen Rome; and finds the fulfilment in its conversion to Christianity. Although he puts the time of composing the Apocalypse down to the exile of John under Domitian, yet he still applies chap. v—xi. to the Jews, and of course regards the book as partly embracing the past.

It might be expected, that a commentary which thus freed the Romish church from the assaults of Protestants, would be popular among the advocates of the papacy. Alcassar met, of course, with general approbation and reception among the Romish community.

In 1618, DAVID PARAEUS, a man of distinguished erudition among the Protestants, published a Commentary on the Apocalypse, which was designed to oppose the views of Alcassar, and to defend the application of chap. xiii—xix. to the papacy. Grammatical and archaeological investigations, moreover, were not neglected by him. It was peculiar to him, that he first advanced and defended the idea, that the Apocalypse is in the form of a *drama;* an idea which Eichhorn has taken great pains to defend and adorn. But although Paraeus was in an error here, yet the internal investigation of the plan of the book was greatly promoted, by thus bringing before the minds of readers questions of this nature. But *antipapistic* commentary found its acme in the exegetical work of HOE VON HONEGG (1610—1640), which was so violent, that even most Protestants declared it to be "Classicum belli sacri contra Pontificios," and deemed it extravagant; while others of a more enthusiastic temperament praised it very highly.

From this time forward, one particular explanation of the Apocalypse gave place to another, in constant succession. There was no general agreement as to the beginning and end of periods, or of the modes of reckoning them. Days were made into years by some; and *prophetic* days, months, and years, were distinguished from *civil* ones. What helped to increase the confusion was, that Daniel and Ezekiel were brought into parallelism with the Apocalypse, and even Canticles was appealed to by some, for the like purpose. Each one, as is usual, found all others who differed from him to be arbitrary in their exegesis; and they more than suspected him of the same.

In 1627, JOSEPH MEDE published his famous *Clavis Apocalyptica,* which has been so often appealed to by almost all subsequent English

writers on the Apocalypse. The peculiarity of his scheme is, that all the leading events in the book are made to be synchronistic or contemporaneous. The hint was taken from the forty-two months in Rev. xi. and xiii. Having fixed on *sameness* of time for the events in vi—xi, and xiii—xix., of course the exposition must be conformed to this. Accordingly, the seven seals upon the book written within and without (5: 1), are symbols of so many successive states of the Roman empire, from the time of Vespasian. The seven trumpets only serve to explain the complex import of the seventh seal; and the correspondences to these he finds in the continued history of the Roman empire. As the last part of the book is *synchronistic*, it must of course be explained in a manner conformed to this. Nothing, indeed, can be more arbitrary, than his whole treatment of his subject, notwithstanding the good degree of learning which he has displayed. His views were soon called in question; and he defended them with zeal and much sincerity. They were at last fundamentally overthrown by Vitringa, in his Anacrisis Apocalypseos, published in 1705, pp. 230 seq. (See a more particular view of Mede's book, in Comm. Introduct. to chap. vi. seq.) The main position of *synchronism* in the different portions of the book, is most palpably against the whole tenor of the book, which, with some trifling exceptions, is *progressive* in its plan.

In the sequel, some interpreters fell upon the old plan of supposing that the seven epistles to the seven churches were symbolic of the seven successive periods or states of the churches; and the rest of the book was of course made subservient to this. Some regarded the several *heptades* of the book as synchronistic; others, as successive. Of course every kind of exegesis and of artifice was resorted to, in order to make out a probability for each one's interpretation. Finally, Coccеius and his followers undertook to establish *dogmatically* the period-system. Soon, however, Witsius and Johannes Markius made efforts to oppose and refute his opinions. But the latter, in his Commentarius, has adopted the principle of repetition of the same things, in the Apocalypse, instead of a progressive development; and so the whole book is of course brought into confusion.

About the middle of the 17th century, appeared the Commentary of Grotius. That philological, historical, and archaeological explanations of the language would be found in him, was of course to be expected by all who knew him. But he went further. He adopted, for substance, the outlines of Alcassar's views. The persecuting Jews, and persecuting heathen Rome, were the main objects of chapter iv—xix; then the flourishing state of the church. Yet he hit upon some peculiarities which will not bear examination. For example; the thousand years began with Constantine's edict in favour of Christianity, A. D. 311;

the end of these, in the 14th century, was when the Ottoman power and Mohammedans broke into Asia Minor and Greece. These of course were the Gog and Magog of the Apocalypse. But notwithstanding some things of this nature, Grotius has given many a good hint, and made not a few fine remarks on the language of the Apocalypse. On the whole, he helped to prepare the way for further and better efforts in regard to this book.

The theological sentiments among the reigning part of Protestants, at this period, hindered the favourable reception of Grotius' work; but more particularly were Protestants displeased with him, for interpreting the Apocalypse as though its main aim was not against the papacy. Few ventured, for a long time, to follow him in this respect. Among these few, were HAMMOND and LE CLERC; neither of whom, for several reasons, found general favour among Protestants. In various particulars, with regard to the application of some smaller portions of the Apocalypse, these two writers differed from Grotius and from each other. But the main scheme was the same.

In 1696, PETERSEN, by his *Geheimnisse der heilig. Offenbarung geöffnet*, etc., attempted to revive the old idea of a terrestrial reign of Christ on earth. But this met with very vigorous opposition. Even the sober and excellent P. J. SPENER, (who admitted the *antipapal* exegesis, but believed that the Apocalypse has revealed the future conversion of the Jews and the final overthrow of Antichrist), on account of his suspected leaning toward the Millenarians, found but little favour as to his apocalyptic labours.

Among the Romanists, in 1690 appeared the famous work of J. B. BOSSUET, entitled *L'Apocalypse avec une Explication*. The talents, profound learning, flowing and popular style, and winning address, of this celebrated writer, all contributed to procure extensive favour for his work among the adherents to the Romish hierarchy. His general plan is this. The history of the church is divided into three periods; the sorrows of the church are comprised in Rev. v—xix; the dominion of the church, in 20: 1—10; the period of its last trial is comprised in the remainder; and this last trial is immediately followed by the general resurrection and the judgment. The final glorification of the church completes the whole. The first period, chapter v—xix, he divides between the Jewish enemies of the church, v—xi, and heathen Romish enemies, xii—xix. The two witnesses in chapter xi, are Christian martyrs. From this chapter onward, he concentrates all in the persecution of the church under Diocletian; in whose name he finds 666 concealed. It is obvious, therefore, that there must be much in the execution of his plan which savours of the arbitrary. But there is so much talent and tact displayed, in the manner of exhibiting the writer's

views, and there are so many fine thoughts developed in the work, and so much of skilful defence of the papacy, which still does not assume the form of defence or at least of polemics, that no one can wonder at the celebrity which this book of Bossuet speedily obtained, and which it has hitherto maintained, in the Romish church. It is a book which may be read with profit by any well informed reader, even at the present time. The occasional extravagances of it, to call them nothing more, need not prevent this. That such can be found, may easily be shown. The locusts in chapter 9: 1 seq., Bossuet represents as symbolizing the *heretics* of the ancient church; and the end of the 1000 years in chapter xx. he refers to the appearance of the Turks in Europe and to the breaking out of the Lutheran heresy! One can hardly suspect that this is anything more than a mere piece of waggery, in such a man as Bossuet.

But few Romish commentators have written on the Apocalypse since the time of Bossuet. These, however, have all trodden in his foot-steps; and his work remains as a kind of regulative among Papists, in respect to their views of the Revelation.

A few years after Bossuet's work was published, (in 1705), appeared the great work of Campegius Vitringa, entitled *Anacrisis Apokalypseos*. In appropriate learning, in patient and extensive research, in a wide-spread knowledge of Hebrew, Rabbinic, Greek, and ancient and modern history, he excelled all his predecessors, and probably all his followers. Vitringa did not reject philological, archaeological, or historical sources, in explaining the Apocalypse. He made diligent and extensive use of all; and his book remains, even down to the present time, a rich store-house of information in these respects—one which has not yet been exhausted. Vitringa was dissatisfied with Grotius and with Bossuet. He wrote partly in opposition to both. But his system of interpretation is, in one leading respect, like that of most Protestants who had preceded him. Corrupted *Christian* Rome is, with him, a leading object in the Apocalypse. But he embraces pagan Rome also. His general view of the book is curious. Excepting a short prologue and epilogue, the work is thus divided: The first part, 1: 9—3: 22, indicates, by the seven epistles, etc., the seven different periods or *internal* states of the churches, down to the end of time; 4: 1—22: 3 exhibits the *external* condition and circumstances of the church; the remainder shows the state of the church in both these respects. Then as to the second portion of the Apocalypse, 4: 1—22: 3, it is subdivided into three visions, viz. 4: 2—8: 1. 8: 2—11: 19, and 12: 1—22: 3. The first of these exhibits the external state of the church from the time of Trajan down to the end of the world; the second depicts Rome, heathen and Christian, under the image of Jerusalem; the third is Rome

antichristian, its contest, its fall, etc. It is unnecessary to give a fuller view of his scheme here; and in order to avoid repetition, I refrain from it. The reader will find such a view in the Introduction to chap. vi. in the Commentary.

While we readily concede, then, to Vitringa more learning, ability, and even tact in some respects, than to any of his predecessors, it is still clear, that from the very nature of his plan he must launch widely into the field of boundless conjecture. His supposed repetitions of the same topics, without any regular order; his symbolical views of the seven epistles; his separation of the internal and external history of the churches; his mixture of pagan Rome and apostate Christian Rome; his application of death on the pale horse to the Saracens and the Turks; of the fifth seal to the Waldenses and Albigenses and other modern martyrs; of the sixth seal either to the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth, or the political changes under Constantine, or the commotions in Europe at the time of the Reformation, or to the destruction of Antichrist, (a rare specimen of guessing); his separating of the seven trumpets entirely from their connection with the seventh seal; his allegation that the half-hour's silence in heaven indicates a long-continued (?) and peaceful and happy state of the church; these, and many more of the like things of which his book is full, show that this great man was making his way hither and thither, with large and unintermitted steps indeed, but often by twilight, and always without any certain compass to guide him. He had, one may concede, a plan of his own, and was true enough to that. But although many commentators who preceded him said more extravagant things than he, yet few if any have on the whole developed a more arbitrary plan. His book may still be consulted with profit. But in recent times, I should doubt whether any can be found who are his real followers. His work is one of the most laboured of all his performances; but it is unlucky in its plan. In one respect he differs widely from a large mass of Protestant commentators. He has no apprehension, that by the *designation of times* in the Apocalypse, any specific chronology is intended. On 11: 2, 3 he remarks, that the notation of time is only an Old Testament analogy, and that what is meant by it is, that the time of persecution is one that is definitely fixed by God, and cannot exceed its bounds. "Would that others had been equally prudent in regard to this matter!" exclaims Lücke; and I can heartily unite with him.

Vitringa, from his weight of character, found a ready hearing among Protestants. His book, although very large, went through three editions in less than twenty years. Yet, in the sequel, some began again to revive the discussions about the definite limitation of times in the Apocalypse. WILLIAM WHISTON, at Cambridge, mathematician and

theologian, went in great earnest into this subject. He showed, as he believed, from the book of Daniel, that a prophetic *day* must mean a *year*. In his *Essay on the Revelation* (1706), he assigned the return and coming of Christ to the year 1715. When this time had passed, without any tokens of fulfilment, he renewed his calculations, and brought out 1766. But as he died in 1752, he had no opportunity to correct, for a third time, the dates which he had twice brought out with a kind of mathematical assurance. But the experiment has been renewed nearly every five or ten years since, in the English world, and in the United States. This very year, we, in this country, have passed the boundary assigned by a large number of enthusiastic men, for the coming of the Lord. But all this avails nothing with individuals of an enthusiastic stamp. As soon as one period has disappointed their calculations, they commence *de novo* with a determination to find another. Generally the last period on which they fix, is beyond their probable natural life. In this way they avoid the vexation of another disappointment.

Among others, at this period, who speculated largely upon the designations of time in the Apocalypse, was a follower of Cocceius, Anthony Driessen. His *Meditationes*, so far as I know, may claim the credit of the discovery, that the thousand years of chap. xx. mean a period each day of which is a year or 360 days; so that the millennial period is to comprise 360,000 years. Followers here and there he has had; particularly in England and America.

In 1740 J. Albert Bengel published his famous work on the Apocalypse, Erklärten Offenbarung Johannis. The designation of *time* is the leading object. Merits the work has of a distinguished exegetical order. The author was one of the most learned, sober, and expert exegetes of his time; and everywhere does he manifest piety and an amiable spirit. Some twenty years did he spend principally on apocalyptic study; and with special reference to fixing specifically the times of fulfilment. His calculations I shall not attempt to detail. The grand key is 666, in 13: 18. The 42 months of the same chapter are, he thinks, of equal extent; so that each prophetic month is equal to 15$\frac{6}{7}$ years, and a prophetic day to half a year. With these assumed elements he finally brought out 1836 as the culmination-point—the grand crisis—of the great events predicted in the Apocalypse. He speaks modestly, but yet with entire assurance that there is no error in his calculation. But still he provides for the possibility of failure; and says, that in such a case, one must apply himself diligently to find out the source of the error that has been committed. *We* have passed 1836, and without any suspicion of a *crisis* in the affairs of the church or the world. Of course we now know what to think of Bengel's scheme. But the exhibition of

such a strange mixture of piety, humility, philological acuteness, tact, sound judgment in some respects, and other good qualities, with enthusiasm, mistaken principles as to scriptural designations of time, caprice even in making out the relations of these to each other, confidence in the certainty of his calculations, and deep interest in the successful reception of them, can be presented, I believe, by few other books that ever were written. Pity that so valuable a life should be thus wasted!

Bengel found favour with some; and a part of his apocalyptic works were translated into English, and some into Danish. But he was also opposed by some; specially by J. G. Pfeiffer, in his *Neuer Versuch*, 1788. Yet he had many defenders, here and there; and even down to the present time his work has not ceased, now and then, to be brought before the public as worthy of their attention.

The great mass of the religious public became, at last, wearied out with the extravagances and the errors of apocalyptic interpreters. This prepared the way for ABAUZIT, in his *Essay on the Apocalypse* (see p. 443 above), to broach the idea, that the whole book relates to the destruction of Judea and Jerusalem. His starting point was, that the book itself declares that all which it predicts would take place *speedily*. Hence Rome, in chap. xiii—xix. points figuratively to Jerusalem. Chap. xxi. xxii. relate to the extension of the church, after the destruction of the Jews.

The same ground was substantially adopted by WETSTEIN, in his edition of the New Testament. Chap. xii. and seq. he refers to civil wars in Italy. The 1000 years dwindle down to 50, from Domitian's death down to the end of the Jewish war under Adrian. Gog and Magog are found in Barchocheba and his rebellion; and the heavenly Jerusalem is only a type of the happy state of the church on earth, which will finally take place. (See fuller development in Commentary, Introduction to chap. vi.). In point of extravagance of application, and arbitrary suppositions, scarcely any one can exceed what Wetstein has exhibited.

WOLFIUS, in his *Curae Philologicae*, collects and criticises upon what others have said; but in passages of difficulty he withholds his own judgment.

HARENBERG, in his *Erklärung*, concentrates the mass of the book upon Jerusalem and Palestine. But from chap. xix, he supposes it goes on to the end of all things. His object was, to unite the older and the more recent method of interpreting the book. But his paradoxical assumptions are so many, that the sober reader, although the author is a sensible man, becomes disinclined toward adopting such interpretations.

SEMLER, who attacked so violently the canonical credit of the book, has given only generalities as to interpretation. He speaks of it as sym-

bolizing changes, calamities, portentous signs, etc.; and also great prosperity and happiness to the church; but he did not put an estimate on the book, which would lead him to make much effort for the interpretation of it.

Soon after Semler had made war upon the Apocalypse, and it was threatened with exclusion from the Canon in Germany, HERDER published his *Maran Atha* or Book of the Coming of the Lord, 1779. With all his exquisite and cultivated taste, Herder was not distinguished for ability as a mere exegete or interpreter. On the score of grammatical and historical interpretation, not much ground was won by him for the Apocalypse. But in regard to the rhetorical character of the book and on the score of aesthetics, Herder's work was really the commencement of a new era. Never had the Apocalypse a more enthusiastic and devoted interpreter. Never before was the nature of its poetic representations so fully and finely unfolded. The man who wrote that peculiar book, the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, must needs be qualified in respect to taste and aesthetical skill to make a right estimate of the Apocalypse. Herder's work is all soul and animation, through and through. It is easy to see, that the commentator entered upon his work and accomplished it with the highest degree of interest and pleasure. The vivid pictures and glowing language which he presented to his readers, served to create more interest in the Apocalypse, and to procure more favour with the public for it, than all the ponderous folios and quartos which had before been published. Nor has the aesthetical judgment of the public been materially changed, since Herder gave it a new direction.

Regarded simply as a book of critical exegesis, Herder's work cannot well be said to claim a high place. He adopted Abauzit's standpoint, and makes everything important in the book relate to the Jewish history. This is a fundamental error, and must of course substantially affect the character of the exegesis. But there is so much of ingenuity and of eloquence, there are such bursts of feeling and flow of heart, in all that Herder says, that his book remains, down to the present hour, with all its errors in interpretation, the most attractive and delightful work that has yet been written upon the Apocalypse. In particular, the skill which he manifests, in showing that "it is a book for all hearts and for all times" (p. 257 seq.), and so is one of an important *practical* character, has not been surpassed, perhaps not equalled, by any other writer. And although he seems to move in a narrow circle, as to the meaning of the book, limiting it so generally to the Jews, yet he makes God's dealings with them, and with his church at that period, symbolical of the circumstances of the church in every age. The kingdom of Christ will ever be victorious over all its enemies.

HARTWIG followed Herder, and wrote three volumes on the Apoca-

lypse, full of learning and the fruits of labour. In his *Apology for the Apocalypse against mistaken Blame and mistaken Praise*, he laboriously defends the genuineness of the book; but in his Commentary, he follows on in the track of Herder. In one respect he differs from him, and accords with Paraeus, viz., that the form of the Apocalypse is *dramatic*. Herder's oriental taste secured him against this; but in this respect, Hartwig was lacking.

HERRENSCHNEIDER, in his *Tentamen Apocalapseos illustrandae*, (1786), a work distinguished for its discrimination and ability, found in the Apocalypse the overthrow of Judaism and of Heathenism, and the universal triumph of the church. This was so ably defended by him, that EICHHORN, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, seems to have made him a model, in regard to general plan. This last work, published in 1791, gave entire new life to apocalyptic study, and for some twenty-five or thirty years seems to have had almost an entire predominance in Germany. It is Eichhorn's ablest work; and although it does not exhibit such ardour and intensity of interest as Herder's book, yet as a work of philology and real explanation of words and phrases, it far exceeds Herder's work. It is indeed the first work which seems to have taken fully the position, that everything in the Apocalypse is to be illustrated in the same way, as in any other work of a similar nature in the Old Testament. The learning and taste of the author enabled him to exhibit many a happy and striking illustration of words and phrases and imagery. He has given an interest to the book, in this respect, which none before him had done. Herder outdid him in glow and eloquence; but Eichhorn is not wanting in taste, and is highly respectable in this work for his philology.

The main features of his exegesis have already been indicated. Substantially they agree with the general tenor of the book. But in the detail, there are some extravagances which will not now find favour. E. g. in 11: 2 seq., Eichhorn finds the *two witnesses* to be the two Jewish high priests, Ananus and Jesus, murdered by the Zealots; while nothing can be clearer, than that the writer produces them as *Christian* witnesses, *τοῖς μάρτυσί μου*. But Herder had committed the same error; and the real meaning in this case is so difficult, that a mistake is not to be thought strange. Eichhorn's work was found fault with by some, and in my apprehension with good reason, because it places the whole composition of the Apocalypse, on the ground of a mere exercise of the inventive powers of poetic imagination. I do not perceive why more than this may not be admitted; unless indeed, we deny that *inspiration* is a reality. I am aware, to be sure, that very many do deny this. But, while I cannot agree with them, I still admit that the Apocalypse, as to its *form*, has all the *indicia* of art and rhetorical disposition

or arrangement. What objection can there be to admitting, that when God speaks to men, he speaks *more humano?* The alphabetic Psalms, especially Ps. cxix, Prov. xxxi, the book of Lamentations, and many portions of the prophets, afford striking exhibitions of the truth of this. I do not and cannot regard Eichhorn as a believer in Christianity, in the sense in which those are who admit the inspired authority of the Scripture. But I can see no objection to accepting thankfully whatever aid he has proffered, in order to illustrate the words, phrases, and imagery of the Apocalypse. We need not depend on him for our *theology*.

Heinrichs, in his *Apocalypsis Illustrata*, has added very little to what Eichhorn and Herder had already exhibited; while, now and then, he indulges in some peculiar extravagances. Other commentators, such as Lange, Hagen, Lindemann, Matthäi, etc., are of little significance. The Commentary of Ewald however, (1828), deserves a very different character. The book is small, but full of thought and illustration. Being a philologist of much higher acquisitions than most of those who had preceded him in writing upon this book, he has brought all his Hebrew learning to bear upon it, and often with signal advantage. The outlines of his general plan are these: (1) The day of vengeance on the enemies of the church, or of Christ's coming, is near, chap. iv—vii; vengeance begins and progresses, 8: 1—11: 14; vengeance is completed, 8: 15—22: 5. So he makes no *catastrophe* at the end of chap. xi, and even represents the author as sparing Jerusalem out of partiality for his own kindred. The artificial arrangement of the book he fully sees, in respect to its *heptades*, and in regard to some of its *triads*. But the latter he has only here and there noticed, omitting to bring into view the three great catastrophes; the three heptades symbolic of punishment, i. e. the seven seals, seven trumpets, and seven vials; and also most of the *triplicities*, which, in every part of the book small and great, everywhere develope themselves. Ewald's critical skepticism is too well known to expect from him any acknowledgment of the divine authority of the book, or of real prediction in it. With him, it is of the same order as the Pollio of Virgil, i. e. the expression of the earnest wishes and hopes of a warm-hearted but enthusiastic Christian; who, in all probability, believed himself to have been aided by the Spirit of God in the composition of the book. We are not bound to follow him here; but we may acknowledge with thankfulness many an important philological suggestion, many an illustration made fully satisfactory, and many an exegetical error of preceding interpreters corrected.

Other recent writers on the Apocalypse, in Germany, scarcely deserve notice. Of the enthusiastic *Bengelian* order was M. F. Semler, Jung Stilling, Typke, Gerken, Opitz, Leutwein, Rühle von Lilienstern, Sander, etc. The last wrote in 1829, and he finds that the commence-

ment of the Millennium will be in 1847. He has a little the advantage of the recent Millenarians of our own country, who placed it first in 1842; then in 1843; next in April, and then in October, of 1844; and who now conclude, that we ought to live in daily expectation of it until it comes. A more recent work on the Apocalypse by Züllig, of which I have only seen an ample review, has excited some attention in Germany. But from the extravagance of some of its positions, I should not think that it could possibly acquire and maintain a good reputation.

Lücke, who has written so large and able a book in the way of *Introduction* to the Apocalypse, has not yet published a Commentary. Whenever he does, the public have reason to believe that some accession will be made to the exegetical ground already won for the Apocalypse.

In the English world, nearly everything has moved on in accordance with the older Protestant views, viz. that the beast and false prophet are symbols of the Romish papal church. Bishop NEWTON on the Prophecies is a book too well known to need description here. Since the present century came in, some of the leading works in England are the following: Whitaker, on the Revelation, 1802; Galloway, Brief Commentaries on Revelation, 1802; Woodhouse, on the Apocalypse, 1805; Holmes' Revelation of St. John, 1815, 2 vol.; A. Fuller's Expository Discourses, 1815; W. Cunningham, Dissertation on the Seals and Trumpets, 1817; Gauntlett's Exposition of Revelation, 1821; Tilloch's Dissertations, 1823; Culbertson's Lectures, 1826, 2 vol.; Croly's Apocalypse, 1827; Woodhouse on the Apocalypse, 1828; Hutcheson's Guide to the Study of Revelation, 1828; The Apocalypse explained (anon.), 1829; W. Jones' Lectures on the Apocalypse, 1829; E. Irving's Lectures on Revelation, 1829; Addis' Heaven opened, or the visions of Daniel and John explained, 1829.

In our own country books designed to be explanatory of the Apocalypse are not wanting. Kinne, Smith, Prof. Bush, and others, have published on this subject. But as their works are well known to readers here, it is unnecessary to characterize them.

Thus have I given a brief sketch of what has been done in past times, in relation to the Apocalypse. That the book has suffered more than any one in the Bible, from extravagant and arbitrary exegesis, no one will deny who is acquainted with its exegetical history. It is to be hoped that some progress may be made in these days of exegetical study, toward a firmer and more satisfactory mode of interpretation. What possible satisfaction, indeed, can ever be felt by a rational man, in any interpretation which rests upon mere surmise or fancy? And such must ever be all those interpretations, which result from considering the book as a mere compendium of civil and ecclesiastical history. But this has been

practised so long, and Protestant feeling is so deeply enlisted against the Romish church, that the chance of substituting a better method of exegesis speedily, is probably but small. Yet it must come at last. It will come, whether we choose or refuse. The radical principles of hermeneutics are every year gaining ground; and inasmuch as they are founded in reason and common sense, they must sooner or later become triumphant.*

§ 28. *Is the Apocalypse designed and adapted for the use of the Christian church in every age?*

This question must be somewhat strictly defined, before a satisfactory answer to it can well be made out.

There are some parts of the Scriptures, which, in one sense, have ceased to be specially useful to the church, as now existing under the Christian dispensation. We might select, for example, the architectural directions for building the tabernacle, and the history of its construction in accordance with them, as contained in the book of Exodus. We might advert to many parts of the Pentateuch, occupied entirely with the minute detail of rites and forms under the Levitical priesthood. We might mention many long and minute catalogues of persons and places, such as the book of Joshua, the first of Chronicles, and also the books of Ezra and Nehemiah exhibit; we might even include many portions of individual history, and the accounts of some apparently unimportant transactions, in the book of Genesis, and in some other books; and perhaps it would not be too much to add, that some of the prophecies respecting small and comparatively insignificant nations, bordering upon the Jews, who have long been blotted from the face of the earth, and in whose destiny we can now have no definite interest, are no longer of

* It is proper that I should acknowledge explicitly, in this place, my obligations to Prof. Lücke for the matter furnished me in his luminous and well arranged *History of the Interpretation of the Apocalypse*, contained in his Einleitung pp. 420 seq. In particular, with respect to several of the works which are characterized in the sketch contained in the present Section, I have been obliged to depend solely on him, because I could not procure a sight of the books in question. But the more important ones have been within my reach; and what I have said of them is principally the result of my own examination, although this substantially agrees, for the most part, with the views which he has suggested. The value to the reader of what is said, will not be changed by this statement; but it is incumbent on me to acknowledge my sources, where I have drawn directly from them, for I do not like to incur a just charge of plagiarism. Throughout this work, it has been my constant endeavour to see with my own eyes, and to think for myself, whenever circumstances rendered it possible. But in a case like that under consideration, where works are characterized to which I could not procure access, I have of course been obliged to depend on others.

special moral benefit to the church of Christ. For if the subject should be viewed in the simple light in which this question would present it, viz., What *moral* and *spiritual* edification is now derivable from such portions of Scripture? it would seem that such an opinion might be made up without much difficulty, inasmuch as the *moral* and *spiritual* instruction of such parts of Scripture can be made out by no direct and natural method of interpretation. We must resort to what is called *spiritualizing*, i. e. we must assign a *ὑπόνοια*, or secret and mystic sense, to the words of the sacred writers in order to educe from such parts of the Bible the instruction now under consideration. But such a resort is of itself a confession, that a moral and spiritual meaning cannot be given to those parts of the Bible that have just been named, unless the usual and obvious laws of interpretation are abandoned.

If the question should now be urged: Why then were such writings permitted to be comprised in the Holy Scriptures? it is not so difficult to give an answer, as some who urge it might imagine. To the church of God as formerly constituted, and embodied in the Jewish nation, all these matters were connected with considerations of no small importance. Everything respecting the tabernacle, the priesthood, the Mosaic ritual, the genealogies of the tribes and families, even the private history of the ancient patriarchs, was civilly, socially, or religiously important. Because that tabernacle, ritual, divisions of tribes and corresponding inheritances, and even individual interest in some of the ancient patriarchs have passed away, through the lapse of some thousands of years and the introduction of a new dispensation, how does or can it follow, that the things named were not in former times a matter of concern and interest to the Jewish nation and church as God's chosen people?

Then, moreover, we need not stop even here. When we now come to examine the genuineness of the Old Testament writings, in order to satisfy our minds whether they were actually written by Jews, as they purport to have been, and whether they were received by the Jewish nation, and looked upon as authentic, and reverenced as such, every particular that I have named above, that may now be regarded as in a good measure destitute of direct moral and spiritual instruction for us, and as superseded in a certain sense by the Gospel, plainly acts an important part; for it gives testimony which cannot well be set aside or overlooked, that the Hebrew Scriptures are the genuine productions of Jewish writers. Every minute personal history, even every special list of the pieces of furniture for the tabernacle, or specific account of rites and forms, and every catalogue of names either of persons or places, goes to establish the verisimilitude of the Hebrew Scriptures as a whole, and to show that they are no work of fiction executed by an impostor.

Placed in this light, then, our question assumes entirely a new atti-

tude; and if we should now be asked, whether those parts of the Old Testament that have been named as destitute in one respect of moral and spiritual instruction adapted to us, are not even of high importance in another respect, as contributing to the credibility of the sacred books in general, and helping to establish their authenticity—if, I say, this question should be now repeated, we may unhesitatingly assume, that *all Scripture is profitable.* And if some parts are not *directly* "doctrine, or correction, or reproof," they at least serve to confirm those parts of the Bible which teach doctrine and administer reproof.

Paul has given us a very simple, and (I may add) a very instructive, exhibition of the uses to which Old Testament history may now be put. Speaking of what came upon the Jews, during their journey through the wilderness, he says: "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and *they are written for our admonition*, upon whom the ends of the world are come," 1 Cor. 10: 11. And again, when speaking of their punishments: "Now these things were examples for us, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted," 1 Cor. 10: 6.

The simple principle which lies at the basis of all is, that as God is always the same, and the relations which men sustain toward him are always substantially the same; so, what he did in one age, or at one time, and to one nation, in order to encourage virtue and holiness, or to restrain vice and impiety, he will in substance always do, everywhere and to all nations. In the *manner* of his proceedings there may be, and is, some diversity. The *matter*, as to rewards and punishments, as to requirements and prohibitions, is and must be always for substance the same.

So then the ancient Scriptures may after all profit us; even what was local, and particular, and temporary, and what can never in all respects be repeated or occur again, may sometimes be of no small importance to us at the present day. We may at least learn instructive history from it. We may regard it as a record of God's providential, or of his retributive dealings; and from these we may learn something both in respect to his nature and his will.

In saying these things, I have had my eye continually upon the Apocalypse. Here is a book, which, if I have rightly unfolded its aim, contains things that relate to the past, the present, and the future. If we should say now that all which respects the destruction of the Jewish persecuting power can no longer be a matter of any interest to us; what is this but to say, that from the *past* we can gather no lessons of importance in respect to the *future;* or that we can discover no ground of encouragement, by the fact that God has fulfilled one prediction, that he will fulfil another? But this we cannot well say, as reasonable and

sober men: and therefore, when the matter is viewed in this light, there can be no difficulty made with the Apocalypse, or serious objection raised against it, because some part of it was specially local and temporary.

But there is another light in which the matter may be placed, that is attended with more apparent difficulty. The book, it may be said, has respect to *persecuting Jews*, *persecuting* PAGAN *Rome*, and *Gog and Magog* (enemies yet unknown); and to all appearance, it pertains only to these. If this be so, of what *general* use can it be to the church of God, at the present day, and throughout the world?

Several answers may be given to this question, all of which seem to have some good foundation.

(1) It is not certain, that the second catastrophe, in the *full* extent of its meaning, has yet taken place. Persecuting Rome, exerting her destructive power through pagan emperors, is indeed fallen. The nation and the government, as they existed in ancient times, are no more. But all the consequences of their past existence and actions, have not yet ceased; nor is it certain that the *distant* parts of the empire, distant in the sense of the Apocalypse, have yet come to the great battle of Armageddon. And if this be the case, the church has still a deep interest in the matter of the Apocalypse.

Besides, the 1000 years of peace and rest are yet future. The defeat of Gog and Magog is still to come. The latter days of peace and glory are yet to ensue. And how can all this be matter of little or no interest to the church at any period? But,

(2) There is another and different view not yet taken, and which is the principal one at which I aim in the present discussion. What has been said already, has been designed merely as a preparation for this part of our discussion.

I regard the Apocalypse as containing matter, which is *a τύπος of all which is to happen in respect to the church.* I regard the whole book as particular illustration of a general principle—of a generic truth. My reasons for this may now be briefly stated.

With the apostle Paul we may safely aver, that "Christ must reign, until *all* enemies be put under his feet;" 1 Cor. 15: 25. It is true, it must be true, that God has made him to be "King of kings and Lord of lords."

Let us suppose, now, that this truth was distinctly in the mind of John, who wrote the Apocalypse; and doubtless such was the fact. In what way, I ask, could he exhibit this truth to the church in the most interesting and attractive form? Might he not have taught it simply, and by a single sentence have given assurance of it to the world, and have left the matter there?

Doubtless it was in his power so to do. It was also in the power of David, when he designed to celebrate the deliverance which he had experienced from the hand of Saul and from the hand of all his enemies, to have said this in so many simple words, and then to have closed his lips in silence. But he has not chosen this method of representing a truth so deeply interesting to himself and others. He has given us, therefore, that sublime and beautiful symbolic representation contained in the 18th Psalm; a piece of composition for which thanks will be given to him as long as taste and a power of appreciating the beautiful shall remain in the world.

It was in the power of Isaiah to announce that great Babylon would fall, by the hand of Cyrus and the united hosts of Media and Persia. He might have simply said this, and refrained from any further declaration. But he has not done so. He has given us the approach of the enemy, the onset of battle, the song of victory, and the final prostration and degradation of the great city with its haughty and hostile monarch. The 13th and 14th chapters of his book will be read with wonder and delight, so long as readers of feeling and taste are to be found.

David and other inspired writers might have simply said, as in the book of Genesis, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head;" or that 'Shiloh would come, and unto him would the gathering of the people be;' and then have rolled up and sealed the prophetic scroll. But these writers have not so done. Witness the 2nd, the 16th, the 45th, the 110th, and other Psalms, and many glowing descriptions in Isaiah, and the other prophets, of the like nature. No one will deny the additional interest which has thus been conferred on the subject of their prophecies. No one will wish a word to be detracted, from all the vivid symbols and glowing descriptions which they have presented us.

Besides this, we should particularly note, when David, for example, brings to view the future king, the Messiah, he invests him with the costume of oriental kings, i. e. with such as it was at the time when he wrote. So too the sons of Korah, in that exquisitely beautiful Psalm, numbered the *forty-fifth.* There we find, first of all, the beauty of the king's person described; then his eloquence is brought to view; next his invincible power and skill in war; his victories on every side; his triumphs; and finally, his retinue of captives, the daughters of foreign kings, and the nuptials which follow. All is in perfect keeping with the time in which the author lived, and with the country in which he wrote.

The application of this, now, to the subject before us is easy and obvious. The theme of the New Testament prophet is the triumph of the church over its enemies and opposers, the universal extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, and its final consummation in glory. What course

should the writer take in order best to accomplish his object? He is called to the special consideration of this theme, by the circumstances of the times in which he lived. Himself an exile under the reign of Nero; the church bleeding at every pore; harassed by enemies without and germinating heresies within; apostasies taking place; timid Christians wavering, and the faint-hearted ready to despond; how shall these evils be arrested? How shall the desponding be cheered, the doubting be confirmed, the bleeding martyrs be made triumphant in death, and the great and glorious work of converting the world to the Christian faith move on, amid circumstances like these? The obvious answer is, by opening upon the world the bright and cheering prospects which Christianity has before it, and showing all who become the disciples of Jesus, that the cause in which they are engaged will surely triumph over its persecutors and enemies, and the whole earth be yet filled with the glory of the Lord.

But how shall this be done? Must he write a treatise, which will exhibit a minute history of the church, in all her external relations down to the end of time? Such a composition would be ill adapted to the then pressing wants of the church, and to the times in which he lived. It must be of vast extent, of course voluminous, unwieldy, and expensive. It could be purchased by few; it could be thoroughly read, only by a still smaller number. It would then necessarily fail of accomplishing the objects of its author, in such a manner as he both wished and intended.

Another course, therefore, must be taken. And this was obviously the one which he has chosen. The evils then pressing upon the church must be considered, and the end to which they would come be fully brought to view. Embittered Jews, on the one hand, had assailed the Christian church from its first beginnings; on the other the overwhelming power of Rome had begun to bear upon it. Christians needed assurance that both these enemies would in due time cease to persecute, and that they would become the victims of divine justice and indignation. Assurances that such would be the case, were evidently adapted to answer the special purposes which called forth the composition of the Apocalypse. Those in whose time it was written, i. e. all who gave credit to the writing, must be enabled to see, that the church could not be extinguished by all its enemies, and that it was steadily advancing toward final and certain triumph.

But what of after ages, when the power of the Jews, and of pagan Rome should become extinct? Would they have any interest in the Apocalypse? Was it a book which would live until the world should be no more, and be for the comfort, the confirmation, the admonition, and the encouragement of Christians in every age?

This brings us to the very gist of the writer's plan. The then present circumstances of the church he had in view; for of this we cannot doubt. And so did Paul, when, for example, he wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, have in view their peculiar circumstances and condition. It is impossible to explain this epistle on any other ground. But is there nothing in it, which is of *present* advantage to us? None will deny this. All the decisions of Paul in respect to disputed or difficult questions; all his precepts, admonitions, threatenings, encouragements, promises, doctrines—all is just as applicable to us, and to all succeeding ages, as it was to the Corinthian Christians, after we have simply abated their peculiar circumstances. So far as our condition and circumstances and duties are like theirs, just so far what Paul said to them belongs to us. *Manente ratione, manet ipsa lex.* And thus may we fairly reason, in respect to all the books of the New Testament.

Let us examine the bearing of the principle here brought to view, upon the Apocalypse. In every age the church has had, and will have, its trials. Jewish or Roman persecution, indeed, will not always rage. But there are other trials. The carnal mind is always enmity against God; and always it will, in some shape or other, display that enmity. There have been, there will be, cold, doubting, hesitating, apostatizing professors of the Christian religion. Is there no instruction, admonition, comfort, hope, to be derived from the Apocalypse, in respect to matters such as these? There is; at least there may be, provided the book be rightly understood.

In a word, is it rational to suppose that such a writer as John believed, that all the evils which the church would experience, would arise from the Jews, the pagan emperors of Rome, and from Gog and Magog? I trust not. 'But why then has he not brought other enemies to view?' This, I answer, would be to compose a work so extensive that few would copy, purchase, or read it, in case a minute and circumstantial history of the church, in all its relations and down to the end of time, should have been undertaken. John, therefore, did what discretion and sound judgment prompted him to do. He has embodied, illustrated, and confirmed, a *principle* in his work, of which the church may and should avail itself, at all times and in all places. It is the simple principle, that *Christ will reign until all enemies are put under his feet.* But in the illustration and confirmation of this, he has selected as examples or specimens, the evils which pressed upon the Christians to whom his work was particularly addressed. How does the principle of composition in this case, then, differ from that which David and other prophets adopt, when they portray the future king Messiah, in the costume of kings who lived at the time when they wrote? Present circumstances were seized upon, in order to convey to their con-

temporaries ideas of future things and persons. Could they have been well understood, in case they had adopted a principle of composition different from this?

Has not John taught us, that in the subjugation of the greater and more violent enemies, we have an assurance that all other enemies will be subdued? Will he who goes forth, conquering and to conquer, leave his work undone, or half done? Has he no opponents but Jews and heathen Rome? Will he have none in future but Gog and Magog? Surely if he subdues *one* enemy, because he is mischievous and dangerous to the church, he will subdue *another* of the same temper and character. He will not save the church from the sword, and leave it to perish by famine and treachery. He will not subdue and destroy one enemy, and give up those who have been redeemed by his blood to the fatal power of another.

Considerations of this nature illustrate and confirm what I mean, when I say, that the writer of the Apocalypse has established important and universal principles, respecting the Redeemer's government and his protection of the church. What he has repeatedly done, for her protection and defence, for her extension and confirmation, he will again do, and continue to do, down to the end of the world. If not, then has he shed his blood in vain; at least it has been poured out to accomplish but a narrow and very limited good. Must we adopt a view of our subject that will lead to such a conclusion?

When we are asked, then, whether apostate Christian Rome is included in the design of the Apocalypse; and whether Mohammedism is included in the same; and whether all the heresies of every age are also included in it; our answer may be: Not primarily and immediately; but still in reality all these, and everything else be it what, where, or when it may, which is opposed to Christianity, is included by *implication* in the Apocalypse. In other words, a principle is established in this book, which embraces all enemies of every kind and name. Why should God save his church from one enemy, and give it up to be laid waste and destroyed by another?

As I may reason from the epistles to the Corinthians, that the *principles* established by Paul there, in reference to the particular state and difficulties of that church, are available at all times and in all places; so in the case before us I may say with the same propriety: It is made certain by the Apocalypse, that *Christ will reign, until he shall have put* ALL *enemies under his feet.*

With such views as these of the book before us, we may well spare all the efforts made to convert the Apocalypse into a Syllabus of history. We need not look for the Pope, or the French revolution, or the Turks, or the Chinese, in it, as being distinctly within the vision of the

prophetic seer. He saw distinctly the enemies then pressing on the church. In describing their fall and ruin, he gives a sample of what must take place in respect to all other enemies and persecutors of the church, of every form and age. This is enough. All the great moral and spiritual purposes of the book are answered by this. The church does not need a minute history of all the external relations in which it will ever stand, in order to be comforted, and warned, and instructed. Enough, when we know that it will come off victorious, at last, from every struggle. Enough that all things will assuredly be put under the feet of its leader, and that it is marching to ultimate triumph and glory.

All this is accomplished by the book before us; accomplished, we may say, in a most admirable and impressive manner. As I have before said, so I say again, that I know of no book in all the Scriptures which contains matter adapted to higher moral excitement than the Apocalypse. Is there any one, which even reaches a point so high in this respect?

Such is the view that I would take of the writer's plan and object. Such the manner in which he has accomplished his design. Can those, who think that thus interpreted he seems to have said and done too little, tell us where he could have stopped, had he gone on to predict individually all the events of interest and importance which were to befall the church down to the end of time? What a book his must have been! How very few could be entitled to *the blessedness of those who read and understand the Revelation!*

If any one still doubts, whether the position is true that has now been taken in reference to the plan of the Apocalypse, viz., the establishment of a general principle by particular illustration; it would be easy to show him, that such is frequently the manner of the Scriptures, in other cases than those already mentioned. Take for example the text in Rev. 21: 8, "The fearful and unconfiding, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." Are these then the only classes of sinners who will be sent to the lake? Surely but a small part of them; but then these are named by the writer as falling more immediately within the scope of his book, and they are proffered as a sample of all who have the like spirit.

Take another case from the writings of Paul. In the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans he gives a list of the vices practised among the Gentiles, on account of which they fell under the just sentence of the divine law. But are the vices there named all of which the Gentiles were guilty, and do no others bring upon offenders the condemnation of the law? This question is not a difficult one, and there can be but one answer to it; and this it is not necessary to repeat.

So in the case before us. When John holds up to view the Jewish power, the Roman pagan power, and that of Gog and Magog, as destroyed by the all conquering might of the Great Head of the church, shall we doubt whether his conquests will be extended to any other enemy, or to all other enemies? What good reason is there to doubt it? And why should not the same principle of interpretation be adopted here, as in the cases that I have just recited?

I am aware how widely different this view of the book is, from that taken by those who make it a mere compendium of history. But from them I am constrained to differ. If the Revelation does not bear the most incontestible marks of reference to events passing when it was composed, I know of no book in the Bible which does. And while I believe this, it is impossible to reconcile it with a scheme of interpretation, which converts the book into an abridgement of history.

In regard to the third catastrophe of the book, or the invasion of Gog and Magog, the first inspection of the matter will show us how differently the writer proceeds, when he comes to the very distant future, with which no passing events of the then present stood connected. Here all is brief, rapid, general. A mere glance at the greatest events is given, after the millennial day. The transitions are indeed so rapid here, that the writer has not stopped even to note them by the usual particles of transition. His manner is brief and abrupt, like that of the Hebrew prophets in similar cases. He did not intend to gratify a prurient curiosity, which solicitously pries into all things future, and scarcely brings itself calmly to trust in God as ordering all events. He says enough, however, to elevate the hopes of the Christian, to animate his efforts, and to guard him against all doubt and despondency. Further he need not go; *his work was not intended to make prophets*, but only to guide and cheer humble inquirers after duty. We cannot well hesitate to say, that to this simple and all-important end it is well adapted.

§ 29. *Does the plan of the Apocalypse involve an Anachronism?*

Of course this question is to be understood as having reference to such a plan of the book as has been exhibited by me, in the preceding pages, and also in the Commentary which follows. The writer of the Apocalypse may be free from any well-grounded charge of anachronism, and yet the plan which I have supposed him to pursue, be liable to a charge of this nature. If such be the case, the probability that I have mistaken the economy of his work, would be somewhat strong; for *anachronism*, certainly the grosser kind of it, would hardly be compatible with what I deem to be the aesthetical character of the Apocalypse.

I do not make this last remark, because I suppose that either *unity* of time, or regular *chronological* sequency of events, is essential to an Epopee. If this were the case, not a few compositions of this nature would have but a dubious claim to the rank in which they are now placed. But still, there is something in itself revolting to an enlightened taste, in anachronism or parachronism. We are always better satisfied with a composition, which exhibits congruities of time and place. Ignorance of the real sequency of events, which one undertakes to relate or to symbolize, detracts from our confidence in the intelligence and taste of a writer. And where ignorance cannot even be suspected, a disregard to such sequency abates not a little of the satisfaction that we otherwise feel, in the perusal of any work.

Supposing now that I have given a correct account of the economy of the Apocalypse, the question may be fairly asked: *Could a charge of anachronism upon this book be well supported?* Or in other words: Is it an objection to the plan of the book, as represented by me, that it is justly chargeable with anachronism?

It may not be inapposite to state, in a few words, the reason why I introduce and discuss this question, at the close of this volume. A friend, in whose judgment I place much confidence, and with whom I was conversing on the subject of the Apocalypse, after I had given him a sketch of my views respecting the economy of the book, and specially of what I have named the *first and second catastrophe*, suggested a difficulty in respect to my plan, which he thought might be raised on the score of *anachronism*. That difficulty has its basis in the following particulars. 'The fall of Jerusalem was in August, A. D. 70. The Jewish war commenced early in the Spring of A. D. 67; and therefore lasted about *three years and a half*. Nero began to persecute Christians after the burning of Rome, according to the best accounts in the latter part of Nov. A. D. 64. This emperor was assassinated on the 9th of June, A. D. 68; and after his death the persecution of Christians immediately ceased. It had lasted about *three years and a half*.' Out of these facts an objection to the plan of interpretation proposed in my work might be elicited. This plan seems to represent the destruction of Jerusalem (the first catastrophe), as *antecedent* to the persecution by Nero, at least as antecedent to his death; while in fact Nero began to persecute in A. D. 64, and died two years and two months before the capture and destruction of Jerusalem.

'And besides this, I have represented the *woman clothed with the sun* (in chap. xii.), as the symbol of the church or people of God; and her flight to the wilderness, in order to find an asylum from the persecuting power of the dragon, as the occasion or ground of Satan's attack upon Christians who lived abroad in foreign countries. How could this be

the cause of Satan's stirring up persecution against Christians in the Roman provinces, when that persecution began in A. D. 64, and Christians did not flee from Judea to Pella until at least the year 67 or 68?'

Such are the difficulties which struck the mind of my friend; and, at first view, they may seem also to others to involve an anachronism in the plan of the Apocalypse which is represented in my work. But these seeming difficulties, when suggested, were not new to me. My own mind had frequently been occupied with them, until I had become satisfied that they are more apparent than real. I have touched upon them more than once, both in the introduction to the Apocalypse and in the commentary. I might perhaps remit the reader to what is there said, without any further remark; but as it is not unlikely, that the minds of some of my readers may be embarrassed with the same difficulties which have been stated above, I have thought it expedient to canvass the subject here, (inasmuch as the printing of this volume remains yet uncompleted), a little more at length than I have elsewhere done, and thus to incur the hazard of being taxed with repetition, rather than of having it said that I have sought to shun the difficulty in question.

First then, as to the general question of *sequency* in regard to the first and second catastrophe.

The Apocalyptist does not represent the second catastrophe as commencing *after* the first had ended. His *description* of the second catastrophe does indeed commence after he has concluded his description of the first. But he does not make, nor have I represented him as making, the second catastrophe to spring out of the termination of the first. On the contrary, chap. xii, as I have endeavoured to show, is *regressive*. It comprises events coeval with the first rise of Christianity. I have no doubt that the writer takes this step, in order to make a palpable distinction between the first and second catastrophe. The second arises from the combined malignity of the dragon, the beast from the sea, and the false prophet.

In a work like that of the Apocalypse, there must be symmetry and concinnity. John has *begun* with the Jewish persecuting power, for a very plain reason. That power persecuted more than thirty years before the Roman government commenced its war upon Christians. The oldest enemy, as well as the most obstinate and persevering, must naturally be taken first. When once upon the tapis, the picture must be finished before the painter could begin another. Nothing could have been more incongruous, considering the general plan of John, than to intermingle the first and second catastrophes, in the descriptions which he has given.

Thus much order and the nature of the case plainly demand. And

what more has John done, in the case before us? If he had made the rise of the second catastrophe *dependent* on the close of the first, then it would be easy to show that anachronism would be involved. But as he plainly has not done this, what reason is there that he should not be at liberty to go on with the description of Jewish persecutors and their fall, until he has completed all which he might desire to say respecting them? Nothing is said by the Apocalyptist, which involves the idea that Nero's persecution or death was *subsequent* to the destruction of the holy city. The writer has indeed connected the first of these with the disappointment, rage, and malice of Satan, and the bitter enmity of his coadjutors; but he has not made the heathen persecution to depend at all on the fall of Jerusalem, or on the desolation of Judea.

Thus much for the general question of sequency in respect to the first and second catastrophe. We come now to the more particular question, in regard to the flight of the woman to the wilderness, as an alleged reason for Satan's beginning a persecution in *foreign* countries.

Nero began his persecution near the close of A. D. 64. Early in A. D. 67 the Jewish war began. Nero lived a little short of eighteen months after this last event. On the supposition that John wrote the Apocalypse a short time before the death of the tyrant, there might have been some sixteen or more months of war against Judea, when the book of Revelation was composed. There was opportunity then for the author of it to know what effects the war had produced, and what it was likely to produce, upon Christianity in Palestine, and what would be the probable, or rather the certain, end of the war.

Two circumstances in respect to this position of affairs deserve our special notice here. The first is, that our Saviour had frequently and solemnly admonished his disciples respecting such a war, and plainly and definitely predicted the issue of the contest, Matt. xxiv. At the same time, he had strictly charged them to flee from the country, whenever the Roman invasion should take place. Can there be any reasonable doubt that Christians in general obeyed this injunction? Even the prudence of an intelligent man would lead him to flee from the scene of such an invasion. What rational ground of hope could there be, that Palestine could resist the mighty power which governed the world, and crushed nations numerous and warlike at its pleasure? It was plainly a case of desperation. Nor was there any well-grounded hope of truce or peace, between parties so exasperated as the Romans and Jews were. What else could Christians do, but to flee from the country? On every ground we may presume that this was speedily done, after Vespasian had marched his overwhelming army into the region of Galilee, early in the Spring of A. D. 67.

Thus it is plain, that Satan's disappointment, described by John, had

an earlier date than the fall of Jerusalem, or the death of Nero. So far as he was concerned with the persecution of the church *abroad*, he put forth his strenuous efforts before the Apocalypse was written, and before the fall of Nero.

One other circumstance deserves particular consideration. It was some time after Nero began to persecute Christians (Nov. A. D. 64), before the contagion of his example spread among the provinces. It was an unusual thing for Romans to persecute on account of religion; and Nero moreover was generally disliked. Indeed, it can hardly be supposed to be probable, that the *general* persecution of Christians in great earnest began before the Jewish war had commenced. Then, it seems obvious that it would spread rapidly. The heathen generally, at that period, confounded, as is well known, Jews and Christians. In this state of things, a war with Judea would make all Jews, and of course Christians, to be everywhere suspected, and cause them to be watched and maligned. Combining the war against Judea with Nero's example in persecuting Christians at Rome, all the provinces, that wished to court the emperor's favour, would be led to persecute the disciples of Christ with severity, under such circumstances. It is to this aggravated assault on the church of Christ to which the Apocalyptist has adverted, when he mentions Satan as quitting the pursuit of the woman who had fled to the wilderness, and going away to persecute *the rest of her seed*, Rev. 12: 17. John regards this *aggravation* of persecuting violence, as occurring after the Jewish war had begun, and after the flight of Christians to Pella, and Satan's consequent disappointment. Is he not true to history, and to the nature of the case?

One other circumstance demands notice, in order to free the plan, which I have supposed the author to pursue, from all imputation and appearance of anachronism. It is a fact, at least I cannot doubt that it is a fact, that Nero's death took place soon after the Apocalypse was written, and some two years *before* the fall of Jerusalem. How now, it may be asked, can it be consistent for this fall to be arranged and spoken of as happening *before* the death of Nero?

The answer to this objection, however, is not very difficult. In the first place, the Jewish persecution had raged for a whole generation, before that of Nero commenced. Of course John must needs take up this first. When once taken up, the catastrophe that ensued must of course be completed. It was imposible to make this part of the work *teres atque rotundus*, without following such a plan.

Then, in the second place, it should be noted, (as has already been said), that the second catastrophe is not made to depend on the first. It is not regarded or treated as a mere *consequent* of it. The Neronic persecution does indeed become aggravated and general, after the defeat

of Satan in Palestine, by the retreat of Christians to Pella. But there is no anachronism, no ὕστερον πρότερον, in this, as we have already seen above; for this retreat took place some time before Nero's death.

In the third place, it should be called to mind here, that while the beast then persecuting the church was to fall *in three years and six months*, (which as a matter of fact actually took place), yet the great contest, although it was suspended by his fall, and peace was restored for a quarter of a century to the church, *was not then finally completed.* Hence, after great Babylon is brought to a ruinous state by the outpouring of the seven vials, as described in chap. xvi, we have still a renewal and prolongation of the contest in chap. xviii. xix. *Final* ruin of the persecuting power comes in the sequel; but the *delays* are different from those in the first catastrophe. The case was different. Rome long continued to be the mistress of the world. But the Jewish national power, broken by the invasion of the Romans, has never since been renewed, at least for any time worth considering. Their existence as a separate national community, ceased with the destruction of Jerusalem. Now we may suppose all this to have been foreseen by the prophetic eye of John. Hence, after the catastrophe in chap. xi, we hear no more of the Jewish persecutors. Not so after the catastrophe in respect to this beast, in chap. xvi. The contest did not fully and finally end with Nero. That particular *beast* was permitted only to complete his 1260 days or forty-two months. But since the beast, considered as a *generic* symbol, designates the *imperial* power of Rome, so that power, which survived the fall of Nero, might be supposed to renew, and did renew, the persecution. John's *main* object, no doubt, was the persecution then raging under Nero. But with this he associated more distant views of subsequent persecuting emperors. Hence the theme commences as it were *de novo*, in chap. xviii. 1 seq.

It is this difference between the *circumstances* of the two catastrophes, which occasioned so much diversity in the mode of treating them. It was this which obliged John to place the death of Nero under the second catastrophe, although it occurred *before* the first was completed. The subsequent persecutions, however, on which he has also cast his prophetic eye, followed long *after* the fall of Jerusalem; and the arrangement which the author has made of the whole connected series of heathen Romish persecutions, is the only one that he could with propriety make. There is, therefore, no anachronism—no real ὕστερον πρότερον as viewed by an aesthetical reader—in the plan which the Apocalypse exhibits.

The main difficulty as to the second catastrophe is, that the reader is prone to interpret the symbol of the *beast* in one uniform manner, i. e. to make it everywhere generic, or to regard it as always denoting the

imperial power in the aggregate. This latter meaning of the symbol is in reality less frequent than the specific one, particularly in chap xiii. and xvii. We should call to mind, that the beast has *seven* heads; that *one* of these is wounded and recovers; that it is the *then reigning* power, called the beast, which persecutes, and which claims divine honours, and the like. Now the symbol of the *beast* cannot designate, in such cases, a mere generic and abstract idea, i. e. that of imperial power, but an individual and concrete and specific power. For the time being, he is the embodyment of the imperial power; and therefore the word θηρίον may well be applied to him without any scruple.

This variable usage of the word *beast*, by John, has been noticed by Ewald, Lücke, and others, of late; but the earlier critics do not seem to have attended to it. The want of such an attention, and of a right understanding of John's real *usus loquendi* in regard to this word, has been the fruitful source of many and serious mistakes and errors in the interpretation of his book. It is time that a matter so plain were better understood.

On the whole, I do not see that John could have made a better *arrangement* of his materials than he has made. The charge of anachronism has surely no solid basis, when the objects which he designed to accomplish are all taken into view, and the poetic nature and disposition of the work are well considered. An unpractised or an inexpert reader may for a moment be perplexed, perhaps, with some apparent parachronisms; but surely the intelligent and practised and candid exegete will not think of sustaining the charge of *chronical* offences against the author of the Apocalypse.

APPENDIX.

EXTRACTS FROM VICTORINUS.

[I embrace the opportunity which is afforded me, at the close of this volume, in consequence of having printed so much in small type, of presenting the reader some specimens of the oldest Commentary on the Apocalypse that is known to be extant, viz. that of Victorinus. A particular account of this writer and martyr under the Diocletian persecution († 303), may be found in p. 454 seq. above. It appears that the genuineness of the work has been doubted by some critics of name. That additions and interpolations have been made, there can be no doubt, see p. 454. But I am quite persuaded, that the substance of the work is now as we have it from the hand of Jerome who edited it, and who commends the sound thought of the writer, although he admits his Latin style to be faulty. It seems that a friend of Jerome (Anatolius), had urged him to edit this work of Victorinus. In the preface to it he states to that friend what he had done in the prosecution of his task. He thus expresses himself: "Inasmuch as you by letters have entreated me [to edit the work], I was unwilling to put it off. But lest I should treat your request with too little respect, I looked over the books of the older writers, and what I have found in their commentaries, I have associated with the labours of Victorinus. From Iota onward [from chap. x. ?], what he regarded as *literal*, and whatever from the beginning of the work to the sign of the cross has been vitiated by unskilful writers, I have corrected. Thence to the end of the volume, know that things have been added. It is yours now to investigate, and to approve of what may please you. If it may please the Lord to give us life and health, my turn of mind, particularly in this volume, will occasion you much severe labour, *Anatoli carissime*." So then, it is out of all question to draw metes and bounds, between what Jerome has *added* and *corrected*, and what he has not. But the style, after all, is in general so diverse from that of Jerome, that I cannot persuade myself that he has gone into extensive changes.

For the rest, I have selected the remarks of the commentator on some of the more difficult parts of the Apocalypse, and have limited myself to these. I begin with remarks on Apoc. xi.]

Et dabo duobus testibus meis, et praedicabunt amicti cilicio dies mille cclx. id est, triennium et menses sex, hoc enim faciunt menses quadraginta duo. Est ergo illorum praedicatio triennium, et menses sex, et regnum Antichristi alterum tantum. De ore illorum Prophetarum exire ignem contra adversarios potestatem verbi dici. Omnes enim plagae quotquot futurae sunt ab Angelis, in eorum voce mittuntur. Multi putant eum Heliam esse, aut Helisaeum, aut Moysen: sed utrique mortui sunt: Hieremiae autem mors non invenitur, quia omnes veteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Hiere-

miam. Nam et ipsum verbum quod factum est ad eum, testificatur ei dicens, *Prius quam figurarem te in ventre, cognovi te: et prius quam de vulva procederes, sanctificavi te: et prophetam in gentibus posui te.* In gentibus autem propheta non fuit, et ideo verbum Dei verax necesse habet quod promisit exhiberet ut in gentibus propheta sit. Hos duos candelabra duo et duas olivas ideo nominavi, ut si in alio legens non intellexisti, hic intelligas. In Zacharia enim uno ex duodecim prophetis scriptum est, Hi sunt duae olivae, et duo candelabra, qui in conspectu Domini terrae stant, id est, sunt in paradiso. Hos ergo oportet interfici ab Antichristo post multas plagas saeculo infixas: quem dicit ascendisse bestiam de abysso. De abysso autem eum ascensurum, multa testimonia enim nobis in hoc capitulo contrahenda sunt. Ait enim Ezechiel, Ecce Assur, cypressus in monte Libano. Assur deprimens cypressos excelsas, ramosas, id est populos multos in monte Libano. Regnum regnorum, id est, Romanorum. Formosus in germinibus, id est, fortis in exercitibus. Aqua, inquit, nutriet eum, id est, multa millia hominum subjecta erunt illi. Et abyssus hausit illum, id est, ructavit eum. Nam et Esaias penè iisdem verbis loquitur. Fuisse autem eum jam in regno Romanorum, et fuisse inter Caesares, et Paulus Apostolus contestatur: ait enim ad Thessalonicenses, *Qui nunc tenet, teneat, donec de medio fiat: et tunc apparebit iniquus ille, cuius est adventus secundum efficaciam Sathanæ in signis et portentis mendacibus.* Et ut scirent illum venturum inquit, tunc erat princeps, adjecit, Arcanum, inquit, malitiae jam oritur. Sed non sua virtute nec patris suscitatur, sed Dei jussu. Quare ergo Paulus idem dicit? Idcirco quod non receperunt amorem Dei, mittet eis Deus spiritum erroris, ut omnes persuadeantur mendacio, qui non sunt persuasi veritate; et Esaias, ait: *Sustinentibus lucem illis tenebrae ortae sunt.*

Hos ergo prophetas ab eodem interfici manifestat Apocalypsis, et quarta die resurgere, ne quis Domino aequalis inveniatur. Sodomam autem et Ægyptum dicit Hierosolymam. Dictus populi persecutor id efficiet. Diligenter ergo et cum summa solicitudine sequi oportet Propheticam praedicationem, et intelligere quoniam spiritus ex parte praedicit et praeposterat, et cum praecucurrerit usque ad novissimum, rursus tempora superiora reperit, et quoniam quod facturus est semel, aliquoties quasi factum ostendit: quod nisi intelligas aliquoties quasi ut factum, aliquoties ut futurum, in grandi caligine inveniri. Ergo interpretatio sequentium dictorum ea monstrabit, ut non ordine lectionis, sed rationis intelligatur. Apertum est templum Dei, quod est in coelo: Apertio est Domini nostri. Templum enim Dei filius ejus est, ipse ait, *Solvite templum hoc, et in tribus diebus excitabo illud*, et dicentibus Judaeis *Quadraginta et sex annis edificatum est templum istud*, Evangelista inquit, *ille dicebat de templo corporis sui.* Arca testamenti, Evangelii praedicatio, et indulgentia delictorum, et omnia bona quae cum illo advenerint, illa dicit aperuisse.

Mulier autem amicta Sole, et Luna sub pedibus suis, habens coronam duodecim stellarum, parturiens in doloribus suis, antiqua Ecclesia est patrum et Prophetarum, et sanctorum Apostolorum, quae gemitus et tormenta habuit desiderii sui usquequo fructum ex plebe sua secundum carnem olim promissum sibi videret Christum ea ipsa gente corpus sumpsisse. Sole autem amicta; speciem resurrectionis significat, et gloriam repromissionis, Luna verò casus sanctorum corporum, et debitum mortis, quo deficere nunquam potest. Nam quemadmodum minuitur vita, sic et augetur: Nec in totum extincta est spes dormientium, ut quidam putant: sed habent in te-

nebris lucem sicut Luna. Corona stellarum duodecim chorum patrum significat secundum carnem nativitatis: ex quibus erat Christus carnem sumpturus. Draco roseus stans et expectans ut cum peperisset filium, devoraret eum, diabolus et angelus refuga scilicet, qui omnium hominum interitum per mortem aequalem posse esse opinabatur. Sed qui de semine natus non erat, nihil morti debebat, propter quod nec devorare eum potuit, id est, in morte retinere. In tertia enim die resurrexit; denique, et priusquam pateretur, tentare eum accessit, tanquam hominem. Sed cum invenisset non illum esse quem putabat, discessit, inquit, ab illo ad tempus. Hunc dicit raptum ad solium Dei, et nos legimus in Actibus Apostolorum quemadmodum loquens cum discipulis suis, raptus est in coelos. Virga ferrea, gladius persecutionis. Omnes recessisse de locis suis, id est, quòd boni movebuntur, persecutionem fugientes.

Quatuor Angeli per quatuor angulos terrae, sive quatuor venti trans Euphratem fluvium, gentes sunt quatuor, quia omni genti à Deo deputatus est Angelus, sicut dicit, Statuit eos super numeros Angelorum Dei, donec sanctorum compleatur numerus, suos non egrediuntur terminos, quia in novissimo cum Antichristo venient. Quod autem dicit, turba multa ex omni tribu, credentibus electorum numerum ostendit, qui per sanguinem agni baptismo purgati, suas stolas fecerunt candidas, servantes gratiam quam acceperunt. Septimo autem sigillo silentium fit in coelo semihora. Semihora initium est quietis aeternae, sed partem intellexit, quia interruptio eadem per ordinem repetit. Nam si esset juge silentium, hic finis narrandi fieret. Angelum autem ascendentem ab oriente solum, Helium Prophetam dicit, qui anticipaturus est tempora Antichristi, ad restituendas Ecclesias et stabiliendas à magna et intolerabili persecutione. Haec in apertione librorum veteris Testamenti et novi praedicata legimus. Ait enim Dominus per Malachiam: *Ecce ego mittam vobis Heliam Thesbitem convertere corda patrum ad filios, et cor hominis ad proximum suum*, id est, ad Christum per poenitentiam convertere corda patrum ad filios, secundum tempus vocationis Judaeos ad sequentis populi fidem revocare. Ideo ostendit etiam numerum ex Judaeis crediturum, et ex gentibus magnam multitudinem.

Mitti etiam in coelum orationes Ecclesiae ab Angelo, et suscipi illas, et contra iram effundi, et scopari regnum Antichristi per Angelos sanctos in Evangelio legimus. Ait enim: *Orate ne incidatis in tentationem. Erit enim angustia magna, qualis non fuit ab origine mundi.* Et nisi abbreviasset Dominus dies illos, non esset salva omnis caro. Hos ergo Archangelos malos septem ad percutiendum Antichristum mittit. Nam et ipse ita dixit: *Tunc mittet filius hominis nuncios suos, et colligent electos ejus de quatuor angulis venti à finibus ejus usque ad fines ejus*; et ante ait per Prophetam: *Tunc erit pax terrae vestrae, cum surrexerint in ea septem pastores, et octo morsus hominum, et indagabunt Assur, hoc est, Antichristum, in fossa Nembrot in damnatione diaboli.* Ecclesiae specie similiter commoti fuerint custodes domus. Ipse autem in parabola ad Apostolos sic ait, cum venissent ad eum operarii, et dixissent, Domine, nonne bonum semen seminasti in agro? Unde ergo ibi lolium? respondit eis, Inimicus homo hoc fecit, cui dixerunt, Vis imus, et eradicamus illud? qui ait: Non, sed sinite utraque crescere usque ad messem, et in temporem messis dicam messoribus, colligere lolium, et facere manipulos, et cremari igni aeterno: triticum autem colligere in horrea mea. Hos messores et pastores et operarios hic Apocalypsis ostendit esse Angelos.

Tuba autem verbum est potestatis, et licet repetat per phialas, non quasi bis factum dicit, sed quoniam semel futurum est quod est decretum à Deo ut fiat, ideò bis dicitur. Quicquid igitur in tubis minus dixit, hinc in phialis est. Nec aspiciendus est ordo dictorum, quoniam saepe Spiritus sanctus ubi ad novissimi temporis finem percurrerit, rursus ad eadem tempora redit, et supplet ea quae minus dixit. Nec requirendus est ordo in Apocalypsi, sed intellectus.

[What follows is very miscellaneous and loose. I omit it, and pass on to more interesting matter, respecting the *beast* from the sea and the land.]

Et vidi de mari bestiam ascendentem similem pardo. Regnum illius temporis Antichristi cum varietate gentium, et populum commixtum significat. Pedes tanquam vasis fortis, et spurcissimae bestiae. Duces, pedes ejus dixit. Os ejus tanquam ora leonum, inquit, est, id est ad sanguinem armatum. Os enim ejus, visio illius est, et lingua quae ad nihilum processura est nisi ad sanguinem effundendum. Capita septem montes sunt in quibus mulier sedet, id est, civitas Romana. Et reges septem sunt, quinque ceciderunt: unus est: alius nondum venit: et cum venerit, brevi tempore erit. Et bestia quam vidisti, de septem est: et octava est. Intelligi oportet tempus quo scriptura Apocalypsis edita est, quoniam tunc erat Caesar Domitianus. Ante illum autem fuerat Titus frater illius, et Vespasianus pater, Galba, Otho, et Vitellius. Hi sunt quinque qui ceciderunt: unus extat, sub quo scribitur Apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet. Alius nondum venit, Nervam dixit. Et cum venerit, brevi tempore erit. Biennium enim non implevit. Et bestia quam vidisti, inquit, de septem est: quoniam ante istos reges Nero regnavit. Et octava est, ait: modo cum illa advenerit, computans loco octavo. Et quoniam in illo est consummatio, adjecit, In interitum vadit. Nam decem reges accepisse regalem potestatem, cum ille moverit ab oriente, aut mittitur ab urbe Roma cum exercitibus suis. Haec cornua decem et decem diademata Daniel ostendit, et tria eradicari de prioribus, hoc est, tres duces primarios ab Antichristo interfici. Caeteros septem dare illi honorem, et consilium, et potestatem, de quibus ait, Hi odient meretricem, urbem scilicet, dicit, Et carnes ejus comburent igni. Unum autem de capitibus occisum in morte, et plaga mortis ejus curata est, Neronem dicit. Constat enim, dum insequeretur eum equitatus missus à senatu, ipsum sibi gulam succidisse, Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerunt Judaei. Et quoniam aliud nomen allaturus est, aliam etiam vitam instituturus ut sic eum tanquam Christum excipiant Judaei. Ait enim Daniel, Desideria mulierum non cognoscet, cum prius fuerit impurissimus: et nullum Deum patrum cognoscet. Non enim seducere populum poterit circuncisionis, nisi legis vendicator. Denique et sanctos non ad idola colenda revocaturus est, sed ad circuncisionem colendam, si quos potuerit seducere. Ita demum faciet ut Christus ab eis appelletur. De inferno autem illum surgere, et superius diximus, verbo Isaiae: *Aqua nutriet illum: et abyssus auxit illum.* Qui tamen licet nomine mutato, et actu immutato veniet, ait spiritus: Numerus ejus nomen hominis est, et numerus ejus sexcenti sexaginta sex. Cum attulerit ad literam Graecam, hunc numerum explebit. AI. N. L. T. CCC. F. V. M. L. X. L. O. L. XX. CCC. I. III. EVN. LCC. N. V. III. P. CIX. K. XXOLXX. CC.

Aliam bestiam subeuntem de terra magna, falsum prophetam dicit, qui facturus est signa et portenta mendacia ante illum in conspectu hominum. Habentem cornua quasi agni, id est, speciem justi hominis: loquentem quasi draco, loquetur autem diaboli malitia plenus. Hic enim facturus est ut ignis de coelo descendat: sed in conspectu hominum. Haec magi per angelos refugas et hodie faciunt. Faciet etiam ut imago aurea Antichristo in templo Hierosolymis ponatur, et intret angelus refuga, et inde voces et sortes reddat. Faciet etiam hic ipse ut accipiant servi et liberi notam in frontibus aut in manibus dextris numerum nominis ejus, ne quis emat vel vendat. Aspernationem autem et exacerbationem Daniel antè praedixerat.

[I add the passage respecting the Millennium, which will show, indeed, that Victorinus (a full Millenarian like Papias and Nepos) has been transformed. But what a strange transformation. One is ready to exclaim: Could Jerome, then, write such stuff as this, and expect any one to respect his opinion? I would hope that, after all, this does not belong to him.]

Omnes animae gentium congregabuntur ad judicium. Nam mille annorum regnum non arbitror esse terminum. Aut si ita sentiendum est, completus annis mille regnare desinunt. Sed ut mei sensus capacitas sentit proferri, quoniam denarius numerus decalogum significat, centenarius virginitatis coronam ostendit. Qui enim virginitatis integrum servaverit propositum, et decalogi fideliter praecepta impleverit, et contra impuros mores vel impuras cogitationes intra cordis cubiculum vigilaverit, ne dominentur ei: iste verè sacerdos est Christi, et millenarium numerum perficiens, integre creditur regnare cum Christo, et apud eum recte ligatus est diabolus. Qui vitiis et dogmatibus haereticorum irretitus est, in eo solutus est diabolus. Sed quia completis mille annis dicit eum solvi, completo perfectorum sanctorum numero, in quibus corpore et corde virginitas regnat, adveniente abominandi adventu? multi ab eo, amore terrenorum seducti supplantabuntur, et simul cum eo ingredientur stagnum, et post modicum tellus reddet sanctorum qui dudum quieverant corpora, immortale cum aeterno rege suscipientes regnum: quos non solum corpore virgineo, sed et lingua et cogitatione exultaturos cum agno demonstrat.

SPECIMEN OF THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH.

[A full account of this interesting relic of antiquity, the reader will find above, p. 40 seq. The summary of contents there given, will impart a just view of the general tenor of the book. I have thought it would be grateful to those of my readers who have had no opportunity to peruse the work as published by Dr. Laurence, to see a specimen of it in the writer's own manner. I shall give that part of the "*Ορασις*, which commences with the seventh chapter of the work, but in the Vision proper would be reckoned the second; see p. 42 seq. above. This gives an account of his rapture through the seven heavens, into the presence of God.]

Chap. VII. (1) The vision, then, which Isaiah saw, he told to Hezekiah, to Josheb his son, to Micah, and to the other prophets. (2) It happened,

he said, when I prophesied, according to what you have heard, that I beheld a glorious angel, whose glory was not like that of the angels I had been accustomed to behold, but he possessed a glory and office so great, that I am unable to express it. (3) I saw him when he seized me by my hand, and I said, "Who art thou? What is thy name? And whither wilt thou cause me to ascend?" For the power of conversing with him was granted to me. (4) He replied: "When I have taken thee up, and shown thee the vision, which I have been sent to show thee, thou shalt instantly understand who I am; but my name thou shalt not know; (5) (For it is necessary that thou shouldest return into thy mortal body), but thou shalt perceive whether I shall cause thee to ascend, because for this purpose have I been sent to thee." (6) Then I rejoiced to hear him speak mildly to me. (7) He said, "Dost thou rejoice, because I speak mildly to thee?" He added, "Him who magnified me, shalt thou behold, as mildly and tranquilly he converses with thee. (8) And the Father of him, who magnifies me, shalt thou behold; for from the seventh heaven was I sent in all these things to illuminate thee."

(9) We then ascended into the firmament, I and he, where I beheld Samael and his powers. Great slaughter was perpetrated by him, and diabolical deeds, while each contended one against another. (10) For as it is above, so is it below, because a similitude of that which takes place in the firmament, exists also here on earth. (11) I said to the angel, "What is this contention?" (12) He answered: "Thus has it been from the foundation of the world, and this slaughter will continue, until he, whom thou shalt behold, shall come and put an end to it." (13) Afterwards he caused me to ascend above the firmament into heaven; (14) Where I beheld a throne in the midst, and angels both upon the right hand and upon the left. (15) Nor were any like the angels, standing on the right hand; for those standing on the right hand possessed a very great degree of splendor. And they all glorified with one voice, (the throne being in the midst), glorifying the same object. After them likewise those upon the left hand, but their voice was not as the voice of those upon the right hand, nor was their splendor as the splendor of the others. (16) Then I inquired of the angel, who was conducting me, saying: "To whom is this glorifying addressed?" (17) He replied: "To the Glory of the seventh heaven, to him who in the holy world causes blindness, and to his Beloved, from whom I have been sent to thee, thither is it addressed."

(18) Again he took me up into the second heaven, the height of which was as the height from the earth to heaven and the firmament. (19) The first heaven was distinguished by a right side and a left, by a throne in the midst, and by the splendor of angels. These things also were in the second heaven; but he who sat upon the throne in the second heaven possessed a glory greater than all. (20) Abundant indeed was the glory of the second heaven; but the splendor of the angels there resembled not that of those, who were in the first heaven. (21) Then I fell on my face to worship him who sat upon the throne; but the angel, my conductor, did not suffer me, saying: "Worship not, neither the angel, nor the throne of him, who is of the sixth heaven, from whence I have been sent to conduct thee, before I tell thee to worship in the seventh heaven. (22) For above all the heavens and their angels thy throne is placed, thy cloathing, and thy crown, which thou shalt thyself behold. (23) And rejoice with great

joy; for those, who love the Most High and his Beloved, shall, at the end of their lives, by the angel of the Holy Spirit, ascend thither."

(24) Then he took me up into the third heaven, where in like manner I beheld those, who were upon the right hand and upon the left, and where also a throne was in the midst, and one sitting upon it, but no record of this world was there commemorated. (25) And I said to the angel, who was with me: "Because the splendor before me will be changing, while I ascend through the different heavens, because there is here no knowledge of the world, vain would prove the attempt to commemorate it." (26) He answered me, saying: "No commemoration takes place on account of its irksomeness. Nothing however is concealed which is here transacted." (27) I then wished to be informed how, if not commemorated, it became known. He answered me saying: "When into the seventh heaven, from whence I was sent, I have caused thee to ascend, into that, which is above these, immediately shalt thou understand, that there is nothing concealed from the thrones, and those, who dwell in the heavens, nor from the angels; and that the splendor, with which they shine, and the glory of him, who sits upon the throne, is greater, as well as the glory of the angels upon the right and upon the left hand more excellent, than that of the heaven, which is under them."

(28) Again he took me up into the fourth heaven, the height of which from the third was greater than from the earth to the firmament. (29) There again I saw angels, upon the right hand and upon the left, and one sitting upon a throne in the midst, and there likewise they glorified. (30) There too the splendor and glory of the angels on the right hand exceeded that of those on the left. (31) Again also the glory of him, who was sitting on the throne, exceeded that of the angels who were upon the right hand, as their glory also exceeded that of those, who were below them.

(32) Then he took me up into the fifth heaven. (33) Where again I perceived that the angels upon the right and the left side, as well as he, who sat upon the throne, possessed a greater glory than those of the fourth heaven. (34) The glory also of those, who were upon the right side, surpassed that of those, who were upon the left, from a triple to a fourfold proportion. (35) While the glory of him, who was upon the throne, exceeded that of the angels, who were upon the right side; (36) As their glory possessed a greater degree of splendor, than that of the angels in the fourth heaven. (37) Then I glorified him, whom no one names, the potent Being, who dwells in the heavens, whose name has never been revealed to any mortal, him who thus transmits glory from heaven to heaven, who augments the splendor of the angels, and renders still more brilliant that of him, who sits upon the throne.

CHAP. VIII. (1) Moreover he took me up into the ether of the sixth heaven, where, immediately as I ascended, I saw an effulgence, which I had not perceived in the fifth heaven. (2) The angels existed in great glory. (3) A holy splendor and a throne was also there. (4) Then I said to the angel, who was conducting me, "What is this, which I behold, my Lord?" (5) He replied: "I am not thy Lord, but thy associate." (6) I further inquired of him, saying, "Are there then no associates of angels?" (7) He said: "Yes; of the sixth heaven and above, in which from this time there is neither a left side, nor a throne placed in the midst; but it is connected with the potency of the seventh heaven, where dwells he, who

is never named, and his Elect, whose name is unrevealed, nor are all the heavens capable of discovering it. (8) For he alone it is, whose voice all the heavens and the thrones obey. I therefore have received power, and been sent to bring thee up here, that thou mightest behold this splendor; (9) That thou mightest see the Lord of all these heavens and these thrones; (10) Who shall nevertheless be changed, until he assume your form and your similitude. (11) Wherefore I say unto thee, Isaiah; because into thy mortal body that which is human must return, that, which has neither perceived, nor ascended, nor understood the things which thou hast understood; (12) That, what thou shalt be, thou shalt behold, for thou shalt participate in the lot of the Lord; by the portion of a tree shalt thou come here, and thence is derived the potency of the sixth heaven and of the ether. (13) Then I greatly magnified my Lord, because by the same kind of death which shall happen to him, I shall be transported to heaven. (14) He continued: "Hear further this from thy fellow servant. When from an alien body by the angel of the Spirit thou hast ascended hither, then shalt thou assume the cloathing, which thou shalt behold; and other numbered, laid up, cloathings shalt thou see. (15) Then also shalt thou be equal to the angels of the seventh heaven."

(16) He now took me up into the sixth heaven, where there was neither a left side, nor a throne in the midst, but all were alike in their appearance, and their splendor was equal. (17) And permission being given me, I glorified, I with them and that angel, and our glorifying was like theirs. (18) There all invoked the first, the Father, and his Beloved the Christ, and the Holy Spirit, all with united voice. (19) But their voice was not like that of the angels, which were in the five heavens. (20) Nor alike was their utterance, but a different voice, as well as a more copious effusion of light was there. (21) Then, while I continued in the sixth heaven, I regarded as darkness the brilliancy, which I had seen in the five heavens; (22) Rejoicing and glorifying him, who had thus graciously bestowed light on those, who wait in expectation of his promise. (23) And I supplicated the angel who was conducting me, that from this time forward I might not return into a world of mortality. (24) Wherefore be assured, O Hezekiah, Josheb my son, and Micah, that great darkness is here, darkness indeed great. (25) Now the angel, who was conducting me, knew what I thought, and he said: "If in this light thou hast rejoiced, how much more wilt thou rejoice in the seventh heaven, from whence I have been sent to thee, when thou shalt behold the light, where the Lord is, and his Beloved, who will hereafter be called in the world the Son. (26) For he who is to exist in a corruptible world has not yet been revealed; nor the cloathing, the thrones, and the crowns, which are reserved for the saints, for those, who shall believe in that Lord, in him, who will descend in your form; since there the light is great and wonderful. (27) With respect however to thy returning into the body no more, understand that the days are not accomplished for thy coming here." (28) Hearing this, I became sorrowful, but he said, "Grieve not."

Chap. IX. (1) Then he raised me into the ether of the seventh heaven. Moreover I heard a voice, exclaiming: "Whither would he ascend who dwells among "strangers?" I feared and trembled. (2) It spoke of me. And while I trembled, behold, from the same place another voice was uttered, which said, "Let holy Isaiah be permitted to ascend hither, for

here is his cloathing." (3) Then I inquired of the angel who was with me, and said: "Who is he that prohibited me? and who he that favoured my ascent?" (4) The angel answered: "He who prohibited thee is he, who dwells above the splendor of the sixth heaven. (5) And he who turned thee back again is thy Lord God, the Lord Christ, who will be called in the world, Jesus; but his name it is impossible to understand, until he has ascended from mortality."

(6) He then took me up into the seventh heaven, where I beheld a miraculous light and angels innumerable. (6) There also I saw all the saints from Adam: (8) Holy Abel, and every other saint. (9) There too I beheld Enoch, and all coeval with him, who were without the cloathing of the flesh: I viewed them in their heavenly cloathing, resembling the angels, who were standing there in great splendor. (10) Nevertheless they sat not upon their thrones, nor were splendid crowns upon their heads. (11) Then I inquired of the angel, who was with me, how it happened, that they had assumed their cloathings but not their thrones and crowns. (12) He said: "Crowns and thrones of glory they have not yet received, but they shall understand and know what their thrones, and what their crowns shall be, after the beloved has descended in the form, in which thou shalt see him descend. (13) For the Lord shall descend into the world in the latter days, and after his descent shall be called Christ. He shall take your form, be reputed flesh, and shall be man. (14) Then shall the God of the world be revealed by his Son. Yet will they lay their hands upon him, and suspend him on a tree, not knowing who he is. (15) In like manner also shall his descent, as thou wilt perceive, be concealed from the heavens, through which he shall pass altogether unknown. (16) But after he has escaped from the angel of death, on the third day he shall rise again, and continue in the world five hundred and forty-five days. (17) And many also of the saints shall ascend with him, whose spirits shall not receive their cloathing, until the Lord Christ shall ascend himself, and with him shall they ascend. (18) Then therefore shall they assume their cloathing, and thrones, and crowns, when he shall have ascended into the seventh heaven."

SPECIMENS OF THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

[A full account of this production may be found above, p. 50 seq. I select those parts which exhibit in a peculiar manner the *Christology* of the author; beginning with chap. xlv.]

Chap. XLV. (1) Parable the second, respecting those who deny the name of the habitation of the holy ones, and of the Lord of spirits. (2) Heaven they shall not ascend, nor shall they come on the earth. This shall be the portion of sinners, who deny the name of the Lord of spirits, and who are thus reserved for the day of punishment and of affliction. (3) In that day shall the Elect one sit upon a throne of glory; and shall choose their conditions and countless habitations, (while their spirits within them shall be

strengthened, when they behold my Elect one,) *shall choose them* for those who have fled for protection to my holy and glorious name. (4) In that day I will cause my Elect one to dwell in the midst of them; will change *the face of* heaven; will bless it, and illuminate it for ever. (5) I will also change *the face of* the earth; will bless it; and cause those whom I have elected to dwell upon it. But those who have committed sin and iniquity shall not inhabit it; for I have marked their proceedings. My righteous ones will I satisfy with peace, placing them before me; but the condemnation of sinners shall draw near, that I may destroy them from the face of the earth.

CHAP. XLVI. (1) There I beheld the Ancient of days, whose head was like white wool, and with him another, whose countenance resembled that of man. His countenance was full of grace, like *that of* one of the holy angels. Then I inquired of one of the angels, who went with me, and who showed me every secret thing, concerning this Son of man; who He was; whence He was; and why He accompanied the Ancient of days. (2) He answered and said to me: This is the Son of man, to whom righteousness belongs; with whom righteousness has dwelt; and who will reveal all the treasures of that which is concealed; for the Lord of spirits has chosen Him; and his portion has surpassed all before the Lord of spirits in everlasting uprightness. (3) This Son of man, whom thou beholdest, shall raise up kings and the mighty from their couches, and the powerful from their thrones; shall loosen the bridles of the powerful, and break in pieces the teeth of sinners. (4) He shall hurl kings from their thrones and their dominions; because they will not exalt and praise Him, nor humble themselves *before Him*, by whom their kingdoms were granted to them. The countenance likewise of the mighty shall He cast down, filling them with confusion. Darkness shall be their habitation, and worms shall be their bed; nor from *that* their bed shall they hope to be again raised, because they exalted not the name of the Lord of spirits. (5) They shall condemn the stars of heaven, shall lift up their hands against the Most High, shall tread upon and inhabit the earth, exhibiting all their works of iniquity, even their works of iniquity. Their strength shall be in their riches, and their faith in the gods whom they have formed with their own hands. They shall deny the name of the Lord of spirits, and shall expel Him from the temples, in which they assemble; (6) And *with Him* the faithful, who suffer in the name of the Lord of spirits.

CHAP. XLVII. (1) In that day the prayer of the holy and the righteous, and the blood of the righteous, shall ascend from the earth into the presence of the Lord of spirits. (2) In that day shall the holy ones assemble, who dwell above the heavens, and with united voice petition, supplicate, praise, laud, and bless the name of the Lord of spirits, on account of the blood of the righteous which has been shed; that the prayer of the righteous may not be intermitted before the Lord of spirits; that for them He would execute judgment; and that his patience may not endure for ever. (3) At that time I beheld the Ancient of days, while He sat upon the throne of his glory, *while* the book of the living was opened in his presence, and *while* all the powers which were above the heavens stood around and before Him. (4) Then were the hearts of the saints full of joy, because the consummation of righteousness was arrived, the supplication of the saints heard, and the blood of the righteous appreciated by the Lord of spirits.

CHAP. XLVIII. (1) In that place I beheld a fountain of righteousness, which never failed, encircled by many springs of wisdom. Of these all the thirsty drank, and were filled with wisdom, having their habitation with the righteous, the elect, and the holy. (2) In that hour was this Son of man invoked before the Lord of spirits, and his name in the presence of the Ancient of days. (3) Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of spirits. A support shall He be for the righteous and the holy to lean upon, without falling; and he shall be the light of nations. (4) He shall be the hope of those whose hearts are troubled. All, who dwell on earth, shall fall down and worship before him; shall bless and glorify Him, and sing praises to the name of the Lord of spirits. (5) Therefore the Elect and the Concealed one existed in His presence, before the world was created, and for ever. (6) In His presence *he existed*, and has revealed to the saints and to the righteous the wisdom of the Lord of spirits; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous, because they have hated and rejected this world of iniquity, and have detested all its works and ways, in the name of the Lord of spirits. (7) For in His name shall they be preserved; and His will shall be their life. In those days shall the kings of the earth and the mighty men, who have gained the world by their achievements, become humble in countenance. (8) For in the day of their anxiety and trouble their souls shall not be saved; and *they shall be* in subjection to those whom I have chosen. (9) I will cast them like hay into the fire, and like lead into the water. Thus shall they burn in the presence of the righteous, and sink in the presence of the holy; nor shall a tenth part of them be found. (10) But in the day of their trouble, the world shall obtain tranquillity. (11) In His presence shall they fall, and not be raised up again; nor shall there be any one to take them out of His hands, and to lift them up: for they have denied the Lord of spirits, and His Messiah. The name of the Lord of spirits shall be blessed.

CHAP. XLVIII. (1) Wisdom is poured forth like water, and glory fails not before Him for ever and ever; for potent is He in all the secrets of righteousness. (2) But iniquity passes away like a shadow, and possesses not a fixed station: for the Elect one stands before the Lord of spirits; and His glory is for ever and ever; and His power from generation to generation. (3) With Him dwells the spirit of intellectual wisdom, the spirit of instruction and of power, and the spirit of those who sleep in righteousness; He shall judge secret things. (4) Nor shall any be able to utter a single word before Him; for the Elect one is in the presence of the Lord of spirits, according to his own pleasure.

CHAP. XLIX. (1) In those days the saints and the chosen shall undergo a change. The light of day shall rest upon them; and the splendor and glory of the saints shall be changed. (2) In the day of trouble evil shall be heaped up upon sinners; but the righteous shall triumph in the name of the Lord of spirits. (3) Others shall be made to see, that they must repent, and forsake the works of their hands; and that glory awaits them not in the presence of the Lord of spirits; yet that by his name they may be saved. The Lord of spirits will have compassion on them; for great is his mercy; and righteousness is in his judgment, and in the presence of his glory; nor in his judgment shall iniquity stand. He who repents not before Him shall perish. (4) Henceforward I will not have mercy on them, saith the Lord of spirits.

CHAP. L. (1) In those days shall the earth deliver up from her womb, and hell deliver up from hers, that which it has received; and destruction shall restore that which it owes. (2) He shall select the righteous and holy from among them; for the day of their salvation has approached. (3) And in those days shall the Elect one sit upon his throne, while every secret of intellectual wisdom shall proceed from his mouth; for the Lord of spirits has gifted and glorified him. (4) In those days the mountains shall skip like rams, and the hills shall leap like young sheep satiated with milk; and all *the righteous* shall become angels in heaven. (5) Their countenance shall be bright with joy; for in those days shall the Elect one be exalted. The earth shall rejoice; the righteous shall inhabit it, and the elect possess it.

CHAP. LXI. (1) Thus the Lord commanded the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who dwell on earth, saying: Open your eyes, and lift up your horns, if you are capable of comprehending the Elect one. (2) The Lord of spirits sat upon the throne of his glory. (3) And the spirit of righteousness was poured out over him. (4) The word of his mouth shall destroy all the sinners and all the ungodly, who shall perish at his presence. (5) In that day shall all the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who possess the earth, stand up, behold, and perceive, that He is sitting on the throne of his glory; that before him the saints shall be judged in righteousness; (6) And that nothing, which shall be spoken before Him, shall be *spoken* in vain. (7) Trouble shall come upon them, as upon a woman in travail, whose labour is severe, when her child comes to the mouth of the womb, and she finds it difficult to bring forth. (8) One portion of them shall look upon another. They shall be astonished, and shall humble their countenance; (9) And trouble shall seize them, when they shall behold this Son of woman sitting upon the throne of his glory. (10) Then shall the kings, the princes, and all who possess the earth, glorify Him who has dominion over all things, Him who was concealed; for from the beginning the Son of man existed in secret, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of his power, and revealed to the elect. (11) He shall sow the congregation of the saints, and of the elect; and all the elect shall stand before Him in that day. (12) All the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who rule over the earth, shall fall down on their faces before Him, and shall worship Him. (13) They shall fix their hopes on this Son of man, shall pray to Him, and petition Him for mercy. (14) Then shall the Lord of spirits hasten to expel them from his presence. Their faces shall be full of confusion, and their faces shall darkness cover. The angels shall take them to punishment, that vengeance may be inflicted on those who have oppressed his children and his elect. And they shall become an example to the saints and to his elect. Through them shall these be made joyful; for the anger of the Lord of spirits shall rest upon them. (15) Then the sword of the Lord of spirits shall be drunk with their blood; but the saints and elect shall be safe in that day; nor the face of the sinners and the ungodly shall they thenceforwards behold. (16) The Lord of spirits shall remain over them: (17) And with this Son of man shall they dwell, eat, lie down, and rise up, for ever and ever. (18) The saints and the elect have arisen from the earth, have left off to depress their countenances, and have been clothed with the garment of life. That garment of life is with

the Lord of spirits in whose presence your garment shall not wax old, nor shall your glory diminish.

[I cannot forbear to insert a portion of the author's *astronomical* revelations; for they must at least amuse the reader much, if they do not instruct him. Thus they run:]

CHAP. LXXI. (1) The book of the revolutions of the luminaries of heaven, according to their respective classes, their respective powers, their respective periods, their respective names, the places where they commence their progress, and their respective months, which Uriel, the holy angel who was with me, explained to me; he who conducts them. The whole account of them, according to every year of the world for ever, until a new work shall be effected, which will be eternal.

(2) This is the first law of the luminaries. The sun *and* the light arrive at the gates of heaven, which are on the east, and on the west of it at the western gates of heaven. (3) I beheld the gates whence the sun goes forth; and the gates where the sun sets; (4) In which gates also the moon rises and sets; and *I beheld* the conductors of the stars, among those who precede them; six *gates were* at the rising, and six at the setting of the sun. (5) All these respectively, one after another, are on a level; and numerous windows are on the right and on the left sides of those gates.

(6) First proceeds forth that great luminary, which is called the sun; the orb of which is as the orb of heaven, the whole of it being replete with splendid and flaming fire. (7) Its chariot, where it ascends, the wind blows. (8) The sun sets in heaven, and, returning by the north, to proceed towards the east, is conducted so as to enter by that gate, and illuminate the face of heaven. (9) In the same manner it goes forth in the first month by a great gate. (10) It goes forth through the fourth of those six gates, which are at the rising of the sun. (11) And in the fourth gate, through which the sun with the moon proceeds, in the first part of it, there are twelve open windows; from which issues out a flame, when they are opened at their proper periods. (12) When the sun rises in heaven, it goes forth through this fourth gate thirty days, and by the fourth gate in the west of heaven on a level with it descends. (13) During that period the day is lengthened from the day, and the night curtailed from the night for thirty days. And then the day is longer by two parts than the night. (14) The day is precisely ten parts, and the night is eight.

(15) The sun goes forth through this fourth gate, and sets in it, and turns to the fifth gate during thirty days; after which it proceeds from, and sets in, the fifth gate. (16) Then the day becomes lengthened by a second portion, so that it is eleven parts; while the night becomes shortened, and is only seven parts. (17) The sun *now* returns to the east, entering into the sixth gate, and rising and setting in the sixth gate thirty-one days, on account of its signs. (18) At that period the day is longer than the night, being twice *as long as* the night; and becomes twelve parts; (19) But the night is shortened, and becomes six parts. Then the sun rises up, that the day may be shortened, and the night lengthened. (20) And the sun returns towards the east, entering into the sixth gate, where it rises and sets for thirty days. (21) When that period is completed, the day becomes shortened precisely one part, so that it is eleven parts, while the night is seven parts. (22) Then the sun goes from the west, from that sixth gate, and

proceeds eastwards, rising in the fifth gate for thirty days, and setting again westwards in the fifth gate of the west. (23) At that period the day becomes shortened two parts; and is ten parts, while the night is eight parts. (24) Then the sun goes from the fifth gate, as it sets in the fifth gate of the west; and rises in the fourth gate for thirty-one days, on account of its signs, setting in the west. (25) At that period the day is made equal with the night; and, being equal with it, the night becomes nine parts, and the day nine parts. (26) Then the sun goes from that gate, as it sets in the west; and returning to the east proceeds by the third gate for thirty days, setting in the west at the third gate. (27) At that period the night is lengthened from the day during thirty mornings, and the day is curtailed from the day during thirty days; the night being ten parts precisely, and the day eight parts. (28) The sun now goes from the third gate, as it sets in the third gate in the west; but returning to the east, it proceeds by the second gate of the east for thirty days. (29) In like manner also it sets in the second gate in the west of heaven. (30) At that period the night is eleven parts, and the day seven parts. (31) Then the sun goes at that time from the second gate, as it sets in the second gate in the west; but returns to the east, *proceeding* by the first gate, for thirty-one days. (32) And sets in the west in the first gate. (33) At that period the night is lengthened as much again as the day. (34) It is twelve parts precisely, while the day is six parts. (35) The sun has *thus* completed its beginnings, and a second time goes round from these beginnings.

[The writer goes on at much greater length with the sun, and then brings into view the moon and stars, in respect to which his revelations are equally wonderful. It is one of the most curious mixtures of fancy and conceit on the one hand, and of half scientific and accurate observation of the course of the heavenly bodies on the other, which can anywhere be found.]

END OF VOL. I.

School of Theology
at Claremont

S-5
41583

A commentary on the Apocalypse.

BS
2825
S7
v.1

Stuart, Moses, 1780-1852.
A commentary on the Apocalypse. New-York,
Van Nostrand & Terrett, 1851 [c1845]
2v. 25cm.

1. Bible. N.T. Revelation--Commentaries.

A10349 V.1

CCSC/mmb

A10349
v.1